

**DRAFT**

**The IV-A / IV-D Interface and Data Exchange:  
A Report of Survey Findings**

April 2004

Table of Contents

- I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 2**
  - A. PURPOSE..... 2
  - B. FINDINGS..... 3
- II. INTRODUCTION ..... 7**
  - A. OBJECTIVES..... 7
  - B. BACKGROUND ..... 8
  - C. URBAN ACADEMY..... 9
  - D. APPROACH ..... 10
- III. OVERVIEW OF SYSTEMS ..... 10**
- IV. BEST PRACTICE AUTOMATION FINDINGS ..... 11**
  - A. DATA EXCHANGE..... 11
    - States with Separate Systems*..... 12
    - States with Integrated Systems* ..... 13
    - Related Data Exchange Topics*..... 14
  - B. DATA QUALITY ..... 14
    - Data Quality Issues* ..... 15
    - Factors Influencing Data Quality*..... 18
    - Technical Solutions for Improving Data Quality* ..... 19
    - Training Solutions for Improving Data Quality* ..... 23
  - C. COLLABORATION ..... 23
    - Technical Staff Collaboration Practices*..... 24
    - Technical Solutions for Data Access* ..... 25
  - D. OTHER RELATED FINDINGS ..... 26
    - Distinctions Between Large and Small Jurisdictions* ..... 26
    - Regulatory Requirements Concerning Data Collection and Sharing*..... 27
- V. IDENTIFYING RECOMMENDATIONS AND BEST PRACTICES..... 28**
- VI. APPENDIX ..... 31**
  - A. APPENDIX A - DCL 03-28 DOCUMENT ..... 32
  - B. APPENDIX B - AT 89-09 DOCUMENT ..... 34
  - C. APPENDIX C - INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS ..... 40
  - D. APPENDIX D - SYSTEMS OVERVIEW BY STATE..... 42
  - E. APPENDIX E - STATE AGENCY PROGRAM ORGANIZATION ..... 46

## I. Executive Summary

### A. Purpose

The Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) contracted with the State Information Technology Consortium (SITC) to complete a study examining the exchange of case-related data between the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs at the state level. The primary purpose of the task is to inventory common data elements that are currently shared between the programs and to better understand the electronic interfaces currently in place that facilitate data sharing.

In July 2003, OCSE issued a Dear Colleague Letter to State IV-A and IV-D Directors urging that effective linkages be established to ensure that “regular interaction” occurred to “provide optimum customer service” and achieve state performance measures. The letter included several examples of collaborative strategies initiated by different state or local governments that increased the level of planning and/or collaboration between TANF intake staff and IV-D caseworkers.

DCL-03-28 addresses the topic of collaboration primarily in non-technical terms. For instance, examples of best practices highlighted in the letter include co-location of staff or joint applicant interview processing. Interaction refers primarily to the sharing of custodial parent and non-custodial parent demographic, historical and support order data.

Recent studies prepared on this topic tend to focus mainly on the programmatic issues and less on the technical issues. Some studies include a brief discussion highlighting the technical factors involved. However, none of the studies examine the interface from a primarily technical perspective. So what of the technical supports in place facilitating interaction and collaboration? The objective of this study is to examine the data that is being shared and highlight collaborative approaches within the context of information technology.

Child support officials from 12 states and territories were contacted between October and December 2003 and asked to participate in the study; ten states were ultimately interviewed. Six of the states participating in the study use separate database systems for collecting and storing IV-D and IV-A program data; four states use an integrated database system for program data. In some cases, the IV-D and IV-A agencies are organized within two different state agencies; in most other cases, the programs are organized within the same agency.

Interviews with state-designated representatives included open discussion as well as a series of prepared questions. All participants were asked during the interview to submit a list of data elements included in the interface between the IV-D and IV-A database(s).

State representatives participating in the survey were asked to describe their experiences in terms of:

**DRAFT**

- the data elements involved in the interface between IV-D and IV-A systems;
- electronic mechanisms of information exchange;
- technical solutions that facilitate or improve information exchange; and
- technical collaboration.

***B. Findings***

OCSE, in response to the Family Support Act of 1988, issued Action Transmittal (AT) 89-09 detailing the minimum set of data elements to be exchanged via an interface between certified Family Assistance Management Information Systems (FAMIS) and CSE systems. Since 1989, the year that AT 89-09 was issued, both the child support and public assistance programs have undergone substantial programmatic transformation. However, the modifications in program scope and purpose that have emerged over the past 15 years have not curtailed the need for information sharing. In fact, there is undoubtedly greater need for collaboration today than in previous years.

Because AT 89-09 is limited to addressing the minimum data exchange requirements, it does not provide a complete picture of the actual information shared between IV-A and IV-D systems. Therefore, states were asked to provide a list of the data elements currently shared between their two systems. States using two separate databases linked by an interface provided a list of data elements involved in the exchange. States using an integrated system supplied copies of the screens that IV-D and IV-A staff use to view data.

Over 180 unique pieces of data besides the elements listed in AT 89-09 were found to be exchanged between the two programs or viewable by the other program's staff. Based on the information provided by the participants, states using separate databases to store IV-A and IV-D data are uploading an average of 47 additional data elements from their IV-A system to the IV-D system. These data elements are in addition to what is specified in AT 89-09. The range includes a low of 30 additional elements (Nebraska) to a high of 66 (Wisconsin). In contrast, the average number of additional elements uploaded from the IV-D system to the IV-A system was found to be 28 elements. The table below lists the common data elements not listed in AT 89-09 that a majority of states in this group upload from the IV-A system to the IV-D system.

**DRAFT**

<b>Common Data Elements Uploaded to the IV-D System by a Majority of States Using Separate Systems</b>		
<b><u>Applicant</u></b>	<b><u>Absent Parent</u></b>	<b><u>Dependent</u></b>
Sex	Sex	Name
Social Security Number	Telephone Number	Sex
Date of Birth	Employer Name / ID	Social Security Number
Telephone Number	Employer Address	Date of Birth
Cooperation / Good Cause Effective Date(s)	Employer Telephone	
Cooperation / Good Cause Reason Code	Employment Start / Stop Dates	
	Separation / Divorce Date	

Two of the four states using an integrated database system for IV-A and IV-D program activity provided copies of the system screens to which workers from each program have access. Based on the data fields found on the screens, these states are sharing an average of 51 additional IV-D-related data elements with IV-A staff and an average of 59 additional IV-A-related data elements with IV-D staff.

Participants were asked if any data elements are currently collected by one program but not shared with the other that would be useful for meeting programmatic requirements. A majority of states indicated that there were none. All states reported that IV-D staff are provided restricted, read-only rights to IV-A system data. Likewise, most states reported that IV-A staff have some type of restricted access to IV-D system data.

States were then asked if there is data not currently collected that would be useful for meeting programmatic requirements. More than half of the respondents indicated that there was data that would help, however each cited different data elements unique to their state. When asked if regulatory restrictions hamper data sharing, most states indicated that there are limits but nothing that impedes a program from meeting programmatic objectives.

States have built a technical capacity to share information that exceeds the 20 plus elements specified in AT 89-09. But providing a facility for staff to record information and disseminate it to another program does not guarantee that the quality of the data will be satisfactory, so participants were asked for their thoughts concerning data quality. If issues were cited, they were also asked for any technical solutions that have been implemented or that are in the process of being developed that serve to improve data quality.

When states were asked if the quality of the data being exchanged can be improved, eight of the ten replied affirmatively. Respondents cited several major issues impacting quality, including data collection errors, minimal data collection, and data maintenance.

## DRAFT

Almost all of the participants discussed problems arising from errors made during the data collection process. Factors discussed included the significance of imperfect clearance processing, inaccurate or skipped data entry, and improper coding. Inaccurate clearance processing can result in duplicate record creation and additional use of staff time to resolve inconsistencies.

Another significant issue discussed by many participants involves the extent of the data collection effort during the client interview process. In general, participants citing this issue expressed frustration that sometimes a minimal amount of data is collected.

Another interesting issue introduced by some of the participants involves data maintenance. Maintenance refers to the process of updating the database with new information about a custodial or non-custodial parent as it becomes available. This is significant because the program with the most current and accurate data source should theoretically have the ability to update the database. Furthermore, since the enactment of PRWORA, state IV-D programs have increased the number of interfaces with other state and Federal databases that provide access to the most current information.

Interview participants then identified and discussed several different factors that often influence the degree of data quality. More often than not, multiple factors simultaneously contribute to substandard data collection. Data entry error accounts for some problems, and there appears to be greater opportunity for data entry errors to occur when information is entered into the system from a paper form as opposed to direct entry into the system during the client interview.

Participants highlighted several different root causes for incomplete data collection including: insufficient time for data collection; insufficient staff resources; and a lack of understanding on the part of TANF staff about why child support data is collected and how it is used, or why it is their responsibility to collect it. A few states cited technical issues that affected data quality.

Participants discussed about technically-based solutions that their state employed to negate the affects of these factors. A variety of approaches have been designed and implemented to counteract the issues previously described. The particular approach that any single state adopts will be influenced by circumstances such as the nature of the problem, resources, time, and urgency. For instance, sometimes a technical approach is favored, sometimes a training-based method is preferred, and other times the process is reviewed and modified.

The table below provides an overview of the types of solutions states reported in the survey.

**DRAFT**

<b><u>Problem</u></b>	<b><u>Technical Solution</u></b>	<b><u>Training Solution</u></b>	<b><u>Process Review</u></b>
Data Collection Errors			
Clearance Process	X		
Skipped Data Entry	X	X	X
Improper Coding	X	X	X
Minimal Data Collection	X	X	
Data Maintenance			X

Since effective data exchange and integration of IV-A and IV- D systems requires communication and cooperation on the part of both programs, states were asked about the level of collaboration between TANF and CSE.

All ten states reported that staff from both programs were involved in the design and development of the integrated system or the interface between separate systems. Furthermore, more than half of the states stated that technical staff meet routinely to discuss IT problems concerning the interface or other related technical issues. Sometimes program staff participate in these technical meetings. All the states felt that regularly scheduled contact improved communication and collaboration.

Other methods implemented include: using a single IT vendor to design / upgrade both systems; co-locating technical staff from each program; regular use of user focus groups involving both IV-A and IV-D local district staff; and designating liaisons at local district sites that interact with system users and provide feedback to technical staff located in the central office. Most of the states interviewed reported that staff from each program have some level of restricted, read-only access to the other’s data.

Finally, States were asked if any distinctions exist between larger jurisdictions and smaller to medium size jurisdictions. In terms of technical capability, none of the states indicated any difference between large and small areas. However, a majority of states reported that significant operational differences can exist.

Several participants commented that smaller and medium sized jurisdictions tend to have less staff turnover which means that the workers collecting data have greater experience and knowledge. As a result, lack of experience can lead to greater errors (for example, when coding). Furthermore, new staff may not receive training about the IV-D program or the electronic referral. Therefore, a greater number of staff in larger jurisdictions potentially do not have a good understanding of why they are collecting the data or the importance of the non-custodial parent information for the child support process.

## DRAFT

There also seems to be greater collaboration between IV-A and IV-D staff in smaller jurisdictions. Caseworkers from TANF and CSE tend to share case information and collaborate more on their respective cases. This results in more accurate case data, which ultimately results in correct and timely case handling.

Participants also pointed to the fact that staff in larger jurisdictions tend to have bigger caseloads and therefore less time to spend with individual clients, and that can hamper thorough data collection.

## II. Introduction

The Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) contracted with the State Information Technology Consortium (SITC) to complete a study examining the exchange of case-related data between the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs at the state level. The primary purpose of the task is to inventory common data elements that are currently shared between the programs and to better understand the electronic interfaces currently in place that facilitate data sharing. The study also seeks to identify impediments related to data exchange and cite specific examples of technical solutions implemented by states to circumvent them.

### A. Objectives

In July 2003, OCSE issued a Dear Colleague Letter<sup>1</sup> to State IV-A and IV-D Directors urging that effective linkages be established to ensure that “regular interaction” occurred to “provide optimum customer service” and achieve state performance measures.<sup>2</sup> The letter included several examples of collaborative strategies initiated by different state or local governments that increased the level of planning and/or collaboration between TANF intake staff and IV-D caseworkers.

DCL-03-28 addresses the topic of collaboration primarily in non-technical terms. For instance, examples of best practices highlighted in the letter include co-location of staff or joint applicant interview processing. Interaction refers primarily to the sharing of custodial parent and non-custodial parent demographic, historical and support order data.

Recent studies prepared on this topic tend to focus mainly on the programmatic issues and less on the technical issues. Some studies include a brief discussion highlighting the technical factors involved. However, none of the studies examine the interface from a primarily technical perspective. So what of the technical supports in place facilitating interaction and collaboration? The

---

<sup>1</sup> OCSE-DCL-03-28. See Appendix A for the complete text.

<sup>2</sup> The five state performance measures are: Paternity Establishment; Support Order Establishment; Current Collections; Arrearage Collections; and Cost Effectiveness. Refer to 45 CFR Ch. III, Part 305.2 Performance Measures (Federal Register, 10-1-2001 Edition) for more information.



## DRAFT

objective of this study is to examine the data that is being shared and highlight collaborative approaches within the context of information technology.

State representatives participating in the survey were asked to describe their experiences in terms of:

- the data elements involved in the interface between IV-D and IV-A systems<sup>3</sup>;
- electronic mechanisms of information exchange;
- technical solutions that facilitate or improve information exchange; and
- technical collaboration.

The results of this study will be made available to other states so that they can benefit from their peers' experiences.

### ***B. Background***

Title IV-D of the Social Security Act of 1975 authorized states to create a Child Support Enforcement office, and since that time IV-D programs have shared information with their IV-A counterparts.<sup>4</sup> Although both programs have undergone varying degrees of reform over time, the necessity for collaboration has not diminished.

The Family Support Act of 1988 established minimum requirements for comprehensive, statewide automated systems supporting IV-D program activity. Furthermore, it required the system to automatically accept and process referrals from the IV-A agency.<sup>5</sup> Initially, IV-D referral data was mainly processed using paper forms; now the information is transmitted both electronically and via paper. In some cases, states have discontinued the use of paper altogether. This trend will most likely continue into the near future.

The enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) introduced significant opportunities and challenges for both programs, including new requirements for additional databases and interfaces.<sup>6</sup> One of the key concepts introduced in the landmark legislation was promoting self-sufficiency. With the introduction of the TANF 60-month benefit time limit, state assistance programs were pressed to help clients

---

<sup>3</sup> Action Transmittal OCSE-AT-89-09 *Revised Minimum Data Elements Required for Certifiable FAMIS and CSE Systems Interface* was used as the baseline for this analysis. Refer to Appendix B for the complete text.

<sup>4</sup> Farrel, Mary, Asaph Glosser, and Karen Gardiner. *Child Support and TANF Interaction: Literature Review*. The Lewin Group, under subcontract to Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, April 11, 2003

<sup>5</sup> Turestsky, Vicki. *Child Support Computer Systems: A Summary of Current and Proposed Federal Requirements*. Center for Law and Social Policy. August 1996.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

## **DRAFT**

achieve a sufficient and stable level of income that would enable them to first reduce and eventually eliminate dependence on a monthly assistance check. Because many assistance cases involved single-parent households that received little to no financial support from the absent parent, one of the strategies to emerge from PRWORA was to increase the level of collaboration between TANF and CSE programs.

Information technology provides a means to effectively and efficiently increase information sharing and collaboration between two or more parties. Given that local-level staff from each program are often times not co-located, automation is the primary tool relied upon by caseworkers to communicate key pieces of case data.

OCSE, in response to the Family Support Act legislation, issued Action Transmittal (AT) 89-09 in May of 1989 detailing the minimum set of data elements to be exchanged via an interface between certified Family Assistance Management Information Systems (FAMIS) and CSE systems. Fifteen years have passed since those data requirements were first issued. Given that significant programmatic changes have occurred and that State governments have become more technically savvy since 1989, the data requirements in AT 89-09, along with some of the significant issues related to their exchange, are examined in this study to discover if any modifications to AT 89-09 are warranted.

### ***C. Urban Academy***

The Office of Child Support Enforcement, in cooperation with the Office of Family Assistance, will be conducting its first IV-A/IV-D Academy for four urban jurisdictions with the largest caseload -- New York City, Houston, Philadelphia and Los Angeles. The purpose of the Academy is to explore operational issues and exchange best practices offering practical solutions which can be implemented or pilot-tested at these sites.

A number of the issues identified by these jurisdictions are similar to those reported by the states participating in this study. Some examples are: the need to have payment and order screens available to IV-A workers as well as IV-D; to notify IV-A workers when child support obtains an order or when first payment is received and to have more automated exchange of accurate custodial parent and non-custodial parent information. Continuous training was also identified as a crucial need for IV-A and IV-D workers for sharing information; learning new technologies; and most importantly, for explaining the importance of how IV-A/IV-D collaborative efforts can improve services for needy families and children.

Improving IV-A and IV-D collaboration is a top federal priority to bring about real change for the neediest families. The sites were selected since they have a great potential for impacting large numbers of families and children and for improving state performance/outcomes for both programs. OCSE will invite a total of six IV-A/IV-D representatives from each urban jurisdiction to participate

**DRAFT**

in the inaugural Academy, which will be held on June 14-15, 2004 in Washington, D.C.

***D. Approach***

Child support officials from 12 states and territories<sup>7</sup> were contacted between October and December 2003 and asked to participate in the study; ten states were ultimately interviewed. Six of the states participating in the study use separate database systems for collecting and storing IV-D and IV-A program data; four states use an integrated database system for program data.<sup>8</sup> In some cases, the IV-D and IV-A agencies are organized within two different state agencies; in most other cases, the programs are organized within the same agency.

Interviews with state-designated representatives included open discussion as well as a series of prepared questions.<sup>9</sup> All participants were asked during the interview to submit a list of data elements included in the interface between the IV-D and IV-A database(s). Notes taken during the interview sessions were sent to each state for confirmation.

An assessment of data elements and interview responses took place during January 2004. Follow-up questions were prepared based on the results of the review and delivered to the participants during the same month. Responses are incorporated into the report.

The findings included in this report are based on the information collected during the interviews and the responses participants provided to the post-interview follow-up questions. The technical solutions implemented to support better exchange of case-related data that are presented in this report will be reviewed and discussed with members of the IV-A / IV-D Workgroup at the ACF State Systems Summit in May 2004. Workgroup members will be asked to formulate recommendations regarding best practices and next steps during the meeting.

**III. Overview of Systems**

The table in Appendix D provides an overview of the IV-D and IV-A systems used by each state participating in the study. Technical specifications for each system were taken from the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) State Systems Profile website.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> States and territories invited to participate in the survey include Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin.

<sup>8</sup> Participating states using an integrated database system include Florida, Maryland, Nevada, and Rhode Island.

<sup>9</sup> Refer to Appendix C for the interview questions and follow-up questions.

<sup>10</sup> Refer to <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/nhsitrc/> for more information.

## DRAFT

Approximately half of the IV-D systems were implemented prior to 1996 while the remaining systems were implemented in 1996 or after. The oldest systems involved in this study were implemented in 1991. As mentioned previously, four states have implemented an integrated database to store IV-D and IV-A information. The remaining six states implemented separate systems with a corresponding interface; four of these states developed their IV-D and IV-A systems using the same programming language, database management system, and operating system. One state, Nevada, adopted the integrated system of another state participating in this study (Rhode Island) and rewrote the code using a different language.

The IV-A and IV-D systems primarily rely on batch processing to transfer select data from one system/module to the other, although in some cases, there is limited real-time exchange of specific data elements. Batch processing is performed nightly in most cases.

States using an integrated database approach have no need for an interface. Most of these states reported that each program has read-only access to the other's data in addition to the screens used for data entry. One state, Nevada, reported that IV-D and IV-A are in the process of jointly developing screens to which both programs will have access. Two states in this group talked about data ownership issues, particularly location information for the non-custodial parent. It seems that the program "owning" update rights to some data elements may not necessarily have the most current information available. This is due in part to accessibility to newly developed state databases such as new hire repositories.

States using an integrated database approach tend not to use paper referrals at all; the referral is sent electronically. In contrast, states using separate systems mostly use a combination of paper and electronic referrals. One state in this group, Washington, recently eliminated paper referrals after determining that the electronic method provided data as good or better than the paper method. Another state, Wisconsin, reported that paper referrals are rarely used. Some states using a combination of paper and electronic referrals have developed automated or manual methods for ensuring a one-to-one match.

## IV. Best Practice Automation Findings

### A. Data Exchange

Since 1989, the year that AT 89-09 was issued, both the child support and public assistance programs have undergone substantial programmatic transformation. However, the modifications in program scope and purpose that have emerged over the past 15 years have not curtailed the need for information sharing. In fact, there is undoubtedly greater need for collaboration today than in previous years. Because AT 89-09 is limited to addressing the minimum data exchange requirements, it does not provide a complete picture of the actual information shared between IV-A and IV-D systems. Therefore, states were asked to provide a list of the data elements currently shared between their two systems. The list of

**DRAFT**

elements that each state provided was compared to the list of elements provided by other states in an effort to understand the current breadth and depth of the data exchange process. Participating states were also asked for feedback on two topics that come to mind when thinking about data exchange: data accessibility and regulatory restrictions governing data sharing.

States using two separate databases linked by an interface provided a list of data elements involved in the exchange. States using an integrated system supplied copies of the screens that IV-D and IV-A staff use to view data.<sup>11</sup> The elements were recorded in a spreadsheet and linked with the appropriate state(s). Over 180 unique pieces of data besides the elements listed in AT 89-09 were found to be exchanged between the two programs or viewable by the other program’s staff.<sup>12</sup> For discussion purposes, the elements were sorted into one of four high-level categories and then grouped into one of several subcategories. The table below lists the categories and subcategories used.

<b><i>Category</i></b>	<b>Applicant / Head of Household / Custodian</b>	<b>Absent Parent / Absent Relative</b>	<b>Dependent / Child</b>	<b>Order of Support</b>
<b><i>Subcategories</i></b>	Identification / Demographic Household Status Good Cause Education / Employment Health Coverage TANF Eligibility / Benefits	Identification / Demographic Household Status Education / Employment Health Coverage Veteran / Government Status Court / Criminal Status Other	Identification / Demographic Household Status Education Health Coverage	(None)

**States with Separate Systems**

All six states using separate systems to record and store IV-A and IV-D data provided information about the data elements currently exchanged between their

---

<sup>11</sup> Eight states provided information regarding data elements by the time this report was prepared.

<sup>12</sup> Data refers to either a single element such as social security number, or it can refer to a group of like elements such as “name” which is comprised of first name, middle initial, last name data elements. Data elements used for records management or to establish relationships in a household were not included in this study. Examples of such elements might include sequence number, case identification number, member number, etc.

**DRAFT**

systems.<sup>13</sup> Based on the information in these lists, states in this category are uploading an average of 47 additional data elements from their IV-A system to the IV-D system. These data elements are in addition to what is specified in AT 89-09. The range includes a low of 30 additional elements (Nebraska) to a high of 66 (Wisconsin). Only two states in this group provided information about the data elements uploaded from the IV-D system to the IV-A system. The average number of additional elements uploaded to the IV-A system is 28.

The table below lists the common data elements not listed in AT 89-09 that a majority of states in this group upload from the IV-A system to the IV-D system.<sup>14</sup> Additional identification / demographic type data for the applicant and dependent is exchanged by a majority of states. Good cause information about the applicant and relationship information about the dependent is frequently exchanged. Data pertaining to the identification / demographic and employment of the absent parent is also frequently passed.

<b>Common Data Elements Uploaded to the IV-D System by a Majority of States Using Separate Systems</b>		
<b><u>Applicant</u></b>	<b><u>Absent Parent</u></b>	<b><u>Dependent</u></b>
Sex	Sex	Name
Social Security Number	Telephone Number	Sex
Date of Birth	Employer Name / ID	Social Security Number
Telephone Number	Employer Address	Date of Birth
Cooperation / Good Cause Effective Date(s)	Employer Telephone	
Cooperation / Good Cause Reason Code	Employment Start / Stop Dates	
	Separation / Divorce Date	

As mentioned above, an average of 47 additional elements are uploaded from IV-A systems to IV-D systems. Of these 47 data elements, 17 pertain to the applicant / custodial parent, 15 elements relate to the absent parent, 13 elements are related to the dependent, and two elements are related to support orders.

**States with Integrated Systems**

Two of the four states using an integrated database system for IV-A and IV-D program activity provided copies of the system screens to which workers from each program have access. Based on the data fields found on the screens, these

---

<sup>13</sup> All six states in this group provided information about the data elements that are uploaded from the IV-A system to the IV-D system. Only two states provided information about data elements that are uploaded from the IV-D system to the IV-A system.

<sup>14</sup> States in this group did not exchange many of the data elements classified as support order elements.

## **DRAFT**

states are sharing an average of 51 additional IV-D-related data elements with IV-A staff and an average of 59 additional IV-A-related data elements with IV-D staff.

It wasn't possible to determine if common elements are shared between IV-A and IV-D programs in this group because of the limited number of states providing the necessary information.

### **Related Data Exchange Topics**

Participants were asked if any data elements are currently collected by one program but not shared with the other that would be useful for meeting programmatic requirements. A majority of states (seven out of ten) indicated that there were none. All states reported that IV-D staff are provided restricted, read-only rights to IV-A system data. Likewise, most states reported that IV-A staff have some type of restricted access to IV-D system data. Information regarding methods used by staff to access data is discussed further in the Collaboration section of this report in the subsection entitled *Technical Solutions for Data Access*.

States were then asked if there is data not currently collected that would be useful for meeting programmatic requirements. More than half of the respondents indicated that there was data that, if collected, would help. Data cited include paternity information, absent parent driver's license, absent parent American Indian indicator, additional insurance information, medical insurance for the dependent, dependent birth state, and out-of-state orders of support. The six states responding yes to the question each cited different data elements unique to their state.

When asked if regulatory restrictions hamper data sharing, most states indicated that there are limits but nothing that impedes a program from meeting programmatic objectives. Several states indicated that financial information obtained by IV-D from the Internal Revenue Service cannot be shared with IV-A. One state, Washington, stated that it would like to share Financial Institution Data Match information because it could be of value during eligibility determination. Another state, Rhode Island, indicated that it could not share Vital Statistic information collected for IV-D purposes, primarily because the existing law that enables Child Support to obtain the data (it is written specifically for IV-D) does not include language that permits them to share the data.

Officials from Wisconsin IV-D believe that it is unnecessary to require the support order information from TANF as outlined in AT 89-09. They feel that the custodial parent and non-custodial parent demographic data are the key pieces of data required from IV-A staff, and that this information, when complete and accurate, facilitates the collection of support data by the IV-D caseworker.

### ***B. Data Quality***

It was learned, in the previous section, that states are going beyond the minimum data exchange requirements. It was also discovered that states have built a

## **DRAFT**

technical capacity to share information that exceeds the 20 plus elements specified in AT 89-09. But providing a facility for staff to record information and disseminate it to another program does not guarantee that the quality of the data will be satisfactory.<sup>15</sup> So participants were asked for their thoughts concerning data quality. If issues were cited, we also asked for any technical solutions that have been implemented or that are in the process of being developed that serve to improve data quality.

### **Data Quality Issues**

When participants were asked if the quality of the data being exchanged can be improved, eight of the ten replied affirmatively. Participants raised several issues, including data collection errors, minimal data collection, and data maintenance.<sup>16</sup>

Almost all of the participants discussed problems arising from errors made during the data collection process. Topics discussed included the significance of imperfect clearance processing, inaccurate or skipped data entry, and improper coding.

A majority of the participants discussed the effect on the IV-D process when the clearance procedure fails to detect that an applicant is known to the system.<sup>17</sup> In most states, the clearance process is used to check the prior history of the custodial parent (i.e., the applicant). In some states, a system check is also performed on the non-custodial parent if the appropriate search criteria is available.

States reported that inaccurate clearance processing can result in duplicate record creation and additional use of staff time to resolve inconsistencies. Florida stated that the current process requires manual review of the data and unfortunately allows for the creation of duplicate individuals or cases when the review is less than satisfactory. Correction of the duplicative case or individual is complicated and can require programming staff to correct the errors. Florida IV-D is continuing work on identifying fixes to the client registration and clearance process on FLORIDA (the integrated IV-A / IV-D system).

In Maryland, CARES (the IV-A system) is searched for records pertaining to the custodial parent and non-custodial parent. Officials reported that existing case information about an absent parent known to CARES is not always detected during the TANF clearance process. And although IV-D staff are normally able to discover that an absent parent is actually known to CARES, it happens after some time has elapsed and staff resources have been used.

---

<sup>15</sup> The term “quality” refers to data accuracy and completeness, and how current the data is. These characteristics were extracted from the definition of “reliable data” defined in 45 CFR Ch. III, Part 305.1 Definitions (Federal Register 10-1-2001 Edition).

<sup>16</sup> Data maintenance refers to the process of updating the database with the most current information available.

<sup>17</sup> During TANF application processing, a search is conducted in the IV-A database to determine if the applicant is known to the system (i.e., finding system records associated with the applicant). Some states will also check the database for records related to the non-custodial parent. Search criteria normally includes social security number, last name, and / or first name. The activity is generally known as the clearance process.



## DRAFT

In Nevada, when an application for TANF is entered into the integrated system known as NOMADS, the clerical staff are to determine if any parties currently exist in the system. If one or more of the parties exist, the staff are supposed to determine if the application would result in a new case due to a change in participants, or if the application refers to all parties in an existing case. Rather than do this person search/resolution process, clerical staff are creating pseudo cases which then require a merge later on.

Wisconsin IV-D stated the desire for TANF workers to be more consistent while validating custodial parent social security numbers when staff seek to determine if the applicant is known to the IV-A system, CARES. TANF staff also may collect the non-custodial parent social security number. A positive identification provides important case history data that enables child support to determine support order status. It also helps to prevent duplicate records for the same custodial or non-custodial parent.

Clearance process issues are not the only concern during data collection. For example, if TANF staff record IV-D information on a paper form, and then later data enter the information into the system, errors can also occur. Louisiana considers that the amount of data found on the paper referral is superior to the electronic referral and also more reliable because TANF staff either make data entry errors or they skip entering data found on the paper form. Montana and Pennsylvania reported experiencing similar problems.

A study conducted by Pennsylvania IV-D found that many data collection errors were a result of worker mistakes, the two most common being incorrect data / missing data and incorrect coding on the part of IV-A intake staff. Pennsylvania was not the only state to cite the coding problem; most states also indicated that they currently experience or previously experienced problems with inaccurate coding.<sup>18</sup> Washington, for example, mentioned that both IV-A and IV-D staff can make errors when coding.

Another significant issue discussed by many participants involves the extent of the data collection effort during the client interview process. In general, participants citing this issue expressed frustration that sometimes a minimal amount of data is collected. For example, Maryland has found that many times TANF staff only collect a minimum amount of information about the non-custodial parent, enough to generate the electronic referral. Nebraska also reported that sometimes minimal data is collected about the non-custodial parent. Rhode Island cited insufficient non-custodial parent data collection, but not on the part of TANF workers (“they have been doing it longer”) but rather when Medicaid staff collect the data.

---

<sup>18</sup> Coding refers to the IV-D status assigned to the case by the TANF worker; it is important because it often triggers the IV-D process. For example, a specific code may indicate there is an absent parent and cause an electronic referral to be generated.

## DRAFT

Washington IV-D reported that, prior to the redesign of its interface, TANF workers were reluctant to enter child support data that duplicated the paper referral form used for data collection and did not follow or match the associated data entry fields in ACES (the IV-A system).

Florida IV-D stated that even though the data fields exist, public assistance staff rarely complete the screens related to child support obligations. Public assistance staff might not take the opportunity to ask the questions provided on the system that would contribute to child support's ability to obtain an order for support.

Another interesting issue introduced by some of the participants involves data maintenance. Maintenance refers to the process of updating the database with new information about a custodial or non-custodial parent as it becomes available. This is significant because the program with the most current and accurate data source should theoretically have the ability to update the database. Furthermore, since the enactment of PRWORA, state IV-D programs have increased the number of interfaces with other state and Federal databases that provide access to the most current information.

Rhode Island IV-A and IV-D are currently talking about this important data quality issue in regards to custodial parent information. In particular, IV-D is requesting update rights from IV-A for the custodial parent address. IV-D has access to the most current address information because of an interface with the state's new hire database (whose data is updated three times a week). TANF currently has sole ownership of the address data, but IV-D is talking with IV-A officials about instituting dual ownership of custodial parent address data.

Nevada reported a similar issue involving the non-custodial parent address. Nevada CSE receives current address data via several interfaces with various statewide databases. However, because TANF and Food Stamps collect this address information from the custodial parent during client contact, the three programs were continually in the process of verifying the most up-to-date data. They resolved the issue by establishing rules governing data ownership. If the person at issue is a non-custodial parent on a IV-D case, the IV-D worker is given update access to the data. If the person at issue is a child or a custodial parent on a TANF case, the TANF workers have update authority to the information. If a caseworker who does not have update ability has information he/she feels is important to the case, he/she can make a contact entry in the case and alert the worker to the new information.

Finally, data quality issues are not solely associated with the TANF program. Although not the focus of this study, it is worthwhile to mention that Medicaid and Child Welfare programs also collect IV-D data depending on case circumstances. Rhode Island remarked that it is seeking better information about the non-custodial parent when collected by the Medicaid program staff during intake and eligibility determination. It explained that both TANF and Medicaid are required to collect data regarding absent parents. The difference is that IV-A has been collecting this data for a longer period of time (Medicaid only began collecting it with the onset of PRWORA) and that part of the problem is a

## DRAFT

learning curve. The other part of the problem is related to system requirements. The TANF program requires a category for eligibility (absence, death, incapacity or unemployment of the non-custodial parent) and the INRHODES system cannot determine eligibility unless both parents are accounted for. In the case of Medicaid, such categories are not required and eligibility is primarily income based and is determined for each individual in the family. Therefore, data collection on the non-custodial parent is required by regulation but not by the system.

Florida IV-D reported that it receives very limited automated updates on IV-E foster care cases. Currently, a case is automatically created, but child support does not have immediate access to information on the public assistance side. The actual management of the foster care case is done on a separate system that does not interface with FLORIDA (the integrated TANF and CSE system). Any change to the child's status is documented and maintained on this separate system and updates to FLORIDA are performed manually by the IV-E caseworker. Information regarding the child's residence, status of any judicial dependency actions, or status of the parental rights is not readily available and many times the IV-D case has remained open when it should have been closed.

### Factors Influencing Data Quality

Interview participants identified and discussed several different factors that often influence the degree of data quality. More often than not, multiple factors simultaneously contribute to substandard data collection.

It was previously stated that data entry error accounts for some problems. Some states opt to use purely electronic forms of data collection during the client interview, bypassing paper forms altogether. Most states in the survey continue to use paper forms to collect client information and subsequently enter the data into the system after the interview. Data entry is sometimes performed by the caseworker and other times by data entry staff. There appears to be greater opportunity for data entry errors to occur when information is entered into the system from a paper form as opposed to direct entry into the system during the client interview.<sup>19</sup> Three of the four states that use direct entry as the sole or primary referral method (see section below entitled *Technical Solutions for Improving Data Quality*) did not report data entry error problems.

Participants highlighted several different root causes for incomplete data collection. Insufficient time was frequently cited as a factor. Local district TANF staff in particular are often under pressure to meet all the data collection requirements for eligibility determination and run out of time for thorough IV-D data collection. Louisiana remarked that there are multiple demands on IV-A workers, and subsequently they do not always give IV-D data collection priority. Another cause closely related to deficient time is insufficient staff resources.

---

<sup>19</sup> Statistics supporting this statement were not available. However, it is reasonable to expect that there is less opportunity for entry errors to occur when the recording process has one step (i.e., directly into the system) as opposed to two steps (i.e., record data on paper, then into the system).

## **DRAFT**

Nebraska staff, for example, stated the opinion that the biggest hurdle regarding quality data collection in their state seems to be time and resource constraints. This problem can be particularly acute in offices located in the larger urban centers or jurisdictions where there tends to be a higher staff turnover rate. Inadequate staffing levels normally result in larger caseloads per caseworker thereby reducing time available per case.

A common factor often repeated by participants suggests that TANF staff simply do not understand why child support data is collected and how it is used, or why it is their responsibility to collect it. Florida remarked that TANF staff do not consider the collection of information and data for child support purposes as a IV-A activity. Pennsylvania observed that most TANF staff do not receive any training about the interface, PACSES (the IV-D system), or child support in general and that many times IV-A staff simply do not understand the importance of some of the information in terms of being able to process a referral. Sometimes they do not know they are responsible for collecting some of the data required for case processing. Pennsylvania IV-D instituted a training program for TANF staff that has helped to reduce the error rate. Louisiana suggested that more training that explains the benefits of IV-D data collection and how the data collected from the IV-A applicant is used is required to improve data quality. They are currently developing materials for this purpose.

A few states cited technical issues that affected data quality. Maryland staff suggested that the clearance process problem in their state could be improved if the CARES (IV-A module) indexing function used by TANF staff to detect if an absent parent is known to the system was upgraded. Louisiana reported that, in the past, system modifications to the IV-A system (L'AMI) have caused problems with some of the data exchanged between the programs. Child support did not become aware of the problem until months after the system change.

Washington IV-D found, during the redesign of its referral and interface functionality, that minor technical issues had to be resolved including data definitions, file upload logistics, and document imaging. IV-A scans important documents that are used by IV-D staff; IV-A and IV-D use different imaging technologies, so access rights had to be considered and resolved.

Finally, potential for coding errors exists if the system does not adequately support code definition lookup functionality. Pennsylvania explained that the IV-A system, CIS, has field level help, but not for all fields and an error message is provided only if an invalid code is used, not necessarily an incorrect code. And although CIS provides lookup capability for codes, it only provides a definition of the code and not a description. Tools are available to help staff find a more thorough description but they involve jumping out of the application and going to an online manual, etc.

### **Technical Solutions for Improving Data Quality**

States identified a number of significant factors that hinder the exchange of quality data and cited some of the causes for them. But what about solutions that

## DRAFT

have been implemented or are in the process of being developed to ensure that an acceptable level of data quality is maintained?

Participants talked about technically-based solutions that their states have employed to negate the affects of these factors. A variety of approaches have been designed and implemented to counteract the issues previously described. The particular approach that any single state adopts will be influenced by circumstances such as the nature of the problem, resources, time, and urgency. For instance, sometimes a technical approach is favored, sometimes a training-based method is preferred, and other times the process is reviewed and modified. Some of the solutions that individual states have initiated are described in the paragraphs below.

Multiple approaches have been devised by states to improve data collection and entry. Several states talked about the negative results that occur when the clearance process fails to detect that an applicant is known to the IV-A system. Nebraska stated that N-FOCUS, the IV-A system, incorporates resolution functionality that assists TANF workers to determine if the applicant already exists in the system. Nevada IV-D discussed that it is currently in the process of creating a new person search / person resolution function to improve clearance process results. Wisconsin IV-A is also in the process of designing new client lookup functionality in CARES (the IV-A system); the goal is to improve staff ability to determine if the applicant is known to the system.

Rhode Island developed a potential duplicate case report that is issued monthly. The report identifies cases where non-custodial parents who have more than one social security number associated with the same custodial parent, have last names that are phonetically the same, have first initials that are equal and are the same sex. Systems staff then merge the cases or make corrections as needed. The system also automatically pops up a potential match screen when the name and other identifying information potentially matches with someone already in the system (both on the TANF/Medicaid/Child Care side and on the IV-D side).

Reducing the reliance on a dual system of paper and electronic referrals may help improve data collection and shrink data entry errors. Washington redesigned its referral module and ultimately eliminated paper forms because the data quality of the electronic method met or surpassed the paper method. For a period of six months after implementing the E-Referral module, IV-D technical staff compared the data quality of the paper form with the e-referral. It was discovered that, over time, approximately 65% of the e-referrals provided as good or better data than the paper referrals, so it was decided that paper was no longer required. IV-A and IV-D continue to explore strategies to improve the quality of data further.

When Florida implemented its integrated system in 1991, the use of paper referrals was discontinued. Currently, IV-D data is entered during the TANF interactive interview with the applicant. In Nebraska, TANF staff also have the option of collecting data from the applicant using an interactive interview that involves direct data entry into N-FOCUS or by recording information on paper forms and data entering later; the method of data entry used varies by location.

## DRAFT

Wisconsin IV-D reports that the referral process is almost exclusively electronic; paper referrals are almost never used. IV-A staff collect information from the applicant and enter the data directly into CARES.<sup>20</sup>

Pennsylvania IV-D, in an effort to reduce coding-related errors, revisited the set of codes in use and discovered that there were duplicates in terms of the “net effect” (i.e., an indicator designating if the non-custodial parent is present in the household). They were able to reduce the number of codes that workers need to use since IV-D was only concerned about non-custodial parent household status indicator. Louisiana, using a similar approach with the state’s Medicaid agency, reduced the number of codes used to indicate the child’s legal status.

Montana is currently working on a system enhancement to TEAMS (the IV-A system) that will address the issue concerning inaccurate or miscoded information. After the enhancement is implemented, TEAMS will verify the accuracy of case codes based on other information that is collected from the client.

Florida CSE has developed a batch program that compares the IV-D case type to the status of the public assistance case. For instance, if the CSE case is coded as a non-TANF case, the system will search the public assistance databases and determine if there was a TANF grant during a particular month. If a discrepancy is found, the system will automatically change the IV-D case type to a TANF case type.

INRHODES, the integrated TANF and CSE system used in Rhode Island, was designed with online help for data fields. The help system provides information about the data field and also about available codes if applicable. Furthermore, both IV-A and IV-D staff have access to policy information at any time online.

Some of the participants talked about system or process redesign efforts that were previously implemented or are being considered. Last year, Washington implemented a redesign of the electronic referral interface between the IV-A and IV-D systems. The primary reason for this redesign was that the IV-A system, ACES, came from another state whose program requirements differed from those in Washington. ACES had to be significantly modified to encompass Washington’s IV-A program, including the referral module to the IV-D agency. For example, many of the data fields in ACES were not mandatory nor even used by the IV-D system, SEMS, so there would be no place to download the data. Furthermore, the number of ACES screens and data fields for the IV-D referral

---

<sup>20</sup> Note that some states, Montana for instance, have discussed eliminating the paper referral but cannot because of legal and process barriers preventing it from happening. In Montana’s case, the paper referral is a requirement because it records the client’s signature verifying agreement to assign their rights to all support collected from the non-custodial parent to the state.

## **DRAFT**

that existed at the time created a significant workload issue. In the end, the referral redesign reduced the fields from multiple screens to one screen including the federally mandated fields as specified in OCSE AT 89-09.

Florida reported future plans for a project that will automate up-front applicant IV-D cooperation determination at the time of the public assistance interview. Child support hopes to implement a checklist that the TANF worker will use while collecting information from the applicant about the non-custodial parent. The enhancement would also permit IV-D to automatically update the client cooperation indicator on the TANF screen.

Nebraska is in the process of making enhancements to its IV-A to IV-D referral. One new feature will include a pop-up window pertaining to the non-custodial parent address that is triggered when the non-custodial parent is added to the IV-A system, N-FOCUS, due to his/her role in the IV-D referral. Data entry will not be mandatory. However, it is hoped that the window will increase the chance that the worker will provide the information if it is known. They are also adding a text field so the worker can add the names of other alleged fathers or other pertinent data to alert the IV-D worker to watch for the required paperwork. Nebraska also remarked that other potential enhancements to the N-FOCUS system would facilitate the TANF worker's ability to collect and record information, such as modifications to screen flows or the sequence in which data is collected on an individual screen.

In regards to the problem of minimal data collection, some states discussed interesting technical approaches that potentially offer relief. In Maryland, the IV-A system CARES is designed so that TANF staff are required to data enter a minimum set of IV-D-related information for the electronic referral to be generated and the TANF eligibility determination process to proceed.

Similarly, Montana IV-D is currently working on an enhancement to TEAMS with IV-A technical staff that will address the issue of missing data by requiring that the IV-A worker enter a minimum set of IV-D data prior to TANF benefit issuance. If some or all of the data is missing, benefits cannot be issued, although eligibility determination can still be conducted.

When the referral process involves both the electronic and paper form method, problems can arise if, for any individual case, there isn't a corresponding paper form for the electronic referral, and vice versa. Several states have developed methods to either better understand the scope of the problem or safeguard against it.

Pennsylvania IV-D developed a database that tracked all referrals coming from IV-A. After being logged in the database, the IV-D staff would attempt to process each referral in PACSES. The disposition of each referral logged in the database was accounted for. Referrals that were processed successfully were noted in the database. Referrals that were not successfully processed were marked and the problem noted. Some referrals in the database were deleted, but only after being approved by the Commonwealth PACSES staff .

## **DRAFT**

In Nebraska, the N-FOCUS system creates comparison reports that identify active TANF cases without a IV-D referral to ensure that there is a corresponding referral for each applicable TANF case. IV-A sends an alert to the TANF worker to remind him/her if the IV-D referral has not been sent. And the Washington e-referral daily file is brought into a web-based interim system that IV-D staff use to manually cross reference and modify existing cases in SEMS or to create new cases.

### **Training Solutions for Improving Data Quality**

Some states have implemented a training approach that targets data collection and entry staff instead of, or in addition to, incorporating a technical solution. Pennsylvania IV-D developed a training program for the County Assistance Offices Income Maintenance staff in an effort to reduce errors. The training includes a PowerPoint presentation and Word document that provide information about the interface, the data being collected, and the reason for the data collection (i.e., how it helps the IV-D process). The training also includes a real-time, hands-on demonstration with PACSES so that TANF workers can get a feel for the system.

Florida believes that training IV-A staff on the importance of collecting and entering correct information is critical. They offer training for staff in both IV-A and IV-D programs to reaffirm the importance of entering correct data into the system the first time and every time. Washington IV-D technical staff developed a training class, in conjunction with IV-A training staff, that targets specific offices or staff that experience data quality issues. Training has been targeted for both IV-A and IV-D staff regarding issues such as Good Cause/Domestic Violence and how to code this, and the appropriate actions to take on cases where these issues are in play.

Training can also be a useful tool for increasing awareness about the importance of data collection efforts. Pennsylvania noted that sometimes IV-A staff do not know they are responsible for collecting some of the data required for IV-D case processing, and remarked that the training program has helped to reduce the error rate. Nebraska acknowledged that IV-A staff in some jurisdictions would probably improve on their data collection efforts if they receive additional training regarding how IV-D data is used and explanations regarding coding, etc. As mentioned previously, Florida continues to provide training that stresses the importance of data collection. And Rhode Island IV-D has provided training for its staff that addresses, for example, why paternity data is needed; the offer to train TANF and Medicaid staff on the topic has been extended to program officials.

### ***C. Collaboration***

One of the participants in the study offered the opinion that the requirements mandated in PRWORA were in fact a catalyst for greater collaboration between the programs in his state. He explained that PRWORA had a significant impact on the need for communication between IV-D and IV-A, as well as with other



## **DRAFT**

departments. Issues such as data reliability, medical support, and the TANF five-year maximum, as well as better defined regulations regarding cooperation, good cause, domestic violence, and data sharing necessitated a higher level of communication than what existed at the time.

The topic of TANF and CSE collaboration routinely involves discussion citing strategies and methods that have been implemented to facilitate interaction between program staff at the state or local level, or interaction between the caseworker and client. Many papers and conferences highlight strategies that states have implemented to improve program collaboration such as co-locating staff at local district sites, cross-training staff, creating coordinator positions, etc. When thinking about collaboration in the context of information technology, a couple of topics come to mind. First, how do technical staff from each program collaborate to ensure that the software development life cycles are synchronized and that programmatic needs are adequately supported? Second, what technical strategies have been adopted to facilitate and enhance the sharing of information between programs?

### **Technical Staff Collaboration Practices**

All ten states reported that staff from both programs were involved in the design and development of the integrated system or the interface between separate systems. More than half of the states stated that technical staff meet routinely to discuss IT problems concerning the interface or other related technical issues. Sometimes program staff participate in these technical meetings. All the states felt that regularly scheduled contact improved communication and collaboration.

Montana commented that CSE and TANF technical staff hold regular informational meetings where issues involving the interface and collaboration are discussed and resolved. During the informational meetings, the best solution to the problem is determined and responsibility for managing the task is assigned. Wisconsin described a similar communication process but with the addition of program representatives. Technical and programmatic staff from both IV-D and IV-A meet routinely to highlight changes in program requirements or planned system upgrades. Wisconsin reported that the IV-A / IV-D Tech Group meetings help to increase the level of planning and collaboration between the two programs. Likewise, Florida IV-D technical staff conduct regularly scheduled formal meetings with TANF program and systems staff to discuss technical issues of interest to both programs.

Nebraska IV-A and IV-D conduct organized focus groups that meet routinely, approximately once a month. During the focus groups, which include local-district TANF and CSE staff, participants are asked to identify problems and potential enhancements to either N-FOCUS or CHARTS. Subsequently, ideas for improving the interface are generated from these sessions.

Washington IV-D has designated "IV-A Liaisons" in each of the field offices who serve as the local system experts. These staff help to identify problems at the local level and do an assessment before passing it along to headquarters IT staff. These liaisons also help to disseminate information about problems or enhancements

## **DRAFT**

that are proposed. Often these liaisons are involved in work groups for proposed enhancements (doing a pilot in one of the offices before implementing statewide).

Rhode Island thought that implementing an integrated system was the most significant strategy that increased technical collaboration. As an example, it commented that child support voluntarily provides all of its new hire data to IV-A, as allowed through PRWORA regulations, to help the TANF program combat welfare fraud. The exchange of data was easy to facilitate because the systems are integrated and the required system changes straightforward.

Maryland, which also uses an integrated system, reports several interesting strategies that improve collaboration. Like other states, IV-A and IV-D staff meet routinely to discuss changes to the Client Information System (CIS). However, technical staff responsible for each of the IV-A and IV-D modules in CIS are also co-located, thus fostering day-to-day communication. Technical staff have also established an interface workgroup that meets quarterly to discuss issues and solutions. Maryland also commented that IV-D and IV-A programs provided at least one representative to participate on CSES (the IV-D module) and CARES (the IV-A module) design teams. Program representatives were required to approve the system specifications before the development phase could begin.

Maryland also utilized the services of a single vendor to design and program both CARES and CSES. This provided for the opportunity for some of the programming staff of the CARES module development team to also participate in the CSES module team. And like Rhode Island, a single vendor is utilized for system maintenance and upgrade services for CIS. Finally, both IV-A and IV-D staff participate in any system maintenance involving the electronic referral.

Finally, Florida is one of two states in the survey whose IV-A and IV-D programs are organized within different agencies. Previously, the programs were organized within a single agency. Florida commented that communication and collaboration can sometimes be a challenge, particularly if an issue affecting one program does not have the same degree of importance for the other program. Rhode Island's programs were also once organized within a single agency but now are separated. It reported that initially, after the separation, collaboration was hindered until lines of communication and operational collaboration specifics were resolved in Memorandums of Agreement established between the two agencies. Appendix E provides information on IV-D and IV-A program organization for the ten states interviewed.

### **Technical Solutions for Data Access**

The basic method of electronic data exchange is the system interface required by the Family Support Act legislation and discussed in AT 89-09. The interface is just one of many requirements that has to be met for FAMIS and CSE system certification. But other data exchange methods exist, and most of the states interviewed reported that staff from each program have some level of restricted, read-only access to the other's data.

## **DRAFT**

In states like Maryland or Florida, integrated IV-A / IV-D systems provide access to screens used by the other program; entry is regulated by some type of system security module that grants access rights based on a number of factors. In Rhode Island, for example, access to various screens and modules is limited on a need to know basis through various system security measures (who the individual is, where he/she works, his/her role in the system, etc). In Nevada, IV-A and IV-D currently view the information in the integrated database using different screens, each designed exclusively for use by a particular program. Nevada TANF and CSE staff are in the process of jointly developing screens to which both IV-A and IV-D will have access.

Several different methods are employed by program staff in states using separate systems to view the other's data. In Nebraska, IV-A staff have restricted access to CHARTS (the IV-D system) case data using interface screens developed for N-FOCUS (the IV-A system) users as well as other staff such as Clerks of the District Courts and Title Companies. In Pennsylvania and Washington, IV-D staff are provided query access to the TANF system data.<sup>21</sup> In Montana, child support staff have read-only access to TEAMS, the TANF system; IV-D workers can view nearly all of the TEAMS screens. IV-D workers are granted access to the TANF system based upon security guidelines and specifications. Once a IV-D position is identified as needing access to IV-A data and has been granted rights, the worker logs onto the mainframe system then selects the TEAMS system from a customized menu.

In an interesting use of web-based technology, Pennsylvania discovered that a portal developed to provide child support clients on-line access to case-specific data also offers utility to local district TANF workers. A limited number of local district TANF workers are granted access rights to the IV-D system to ensure sufficient system response time and because 80% of the IV-D caseload is non-TANF. However, TANF clients periodically come in with an issue concerning child support, and access to IV-D case information (such as financial information) is required to resolve the issue. Limiting the number of staff with system access presents a challenge when a client raises such an issue and staff with access rights are not available, thus inhibiting the worker's ability to respond adequately. To solve this dilemma, IV-D provided all IV-A staff access to the web-based portal. TANF staff now use the portal, known as the Child Support Web Site, to gain access to necessary client information and are better able to respond to IV-D-related issues in a more timely manner.

### ***D. Other Related Findings***

#### **Distinctions Between Large and Small Jurisdictions**

Counties with large populations, particularly those with sizeable urban centers, tend to have bigger IT budgets. But does this mean they have greater technical capacity and therefore more sophisticated data collection or exchange

---

<sup>21</sup> Note that select IV-D staff in Pennsylvania have query access to the TANF system.

## **DRAFT**

mechanisms in place than other jurisdictions? States were asked if any distinctions exist between larger jurisdictions and smaller to medium size jurisdictions.

In terms of technical capability, none of the states indicated any difference between large and small areas. Maryland reported that all jurisdictions operate on the same statewide system. Montana stated that it does not distinguish between large, medium, or small jurisdictions; all jurisdictions are treated the same. Most states responded similarly. However, a majority of states reported that significant operational differences can exist.

Several participants commented that smaller and medium sized jurisdictions tend to have less staff turnover which means that the workers collecting data have greater experience and knowledge. Maryland stated that there is greater turnover of TANF staff in larger jurisdictions so there is less experience, on average, among workers as compared to staff in smaller to medium size jurisdictions. As a result, lack of experience can lead to greater errors (for example, when coding). Furthermore, new staff do not receive training about the IV-D program or the electronic referral. Therefore, a greater number of staff in larger jurisdictions generally do not have a good understanding of why they are collecting the data or the importance of the non-custodial parent information for the child support process. Several other states also mentioned that lack of training about IV-D hindered the data collection process.

There also seems to be greater collaboration between IV-A and IV-D staff in smaller jurisdictions. Florida reported that whenever TANF and CSE offices are co-located in the smaller rural areas, there is more interaction between the TANF and CSE staff. Caseworkers from TANF and CSE tend to share case information and collaborate more on their respective cases. This results in more accurate case data, which ultimately results in correct and timely case handling.

Participants also pointed to the fact that staff in larger jurisdictions tend to have bigger caseloads and therefore less time to spend with individual clients, and that can hamper thorough data collection. One state mentioned that there seemed to be more commitment among staff in smaller jurisdictions. Another state expressed the belief that staff in smaller localities were more consistent and accurate.

### **Regulatory Requirements Concerning Data Collection and Sharing**

Some states expressed comments or opinions related to data exchange requirements during the interview. Two states, Wisconsin and Louisiana, remarked that they have been unable to find legislation that specifies the data elements that IV-D or IV-A are required to provide. Wisconsin noted that staff have been unable to locate legislative, regulatory, or system certification requirements concerning the data TANF agencies must provide to IV-D.

Louisiana IV-D expressed particular interest in obtaining any regulations specifying data sharing requirements because it is involved in the analysis of a “One-Stop” concept that would implement an integrated approach to the delivery

## **DRAFT**

of the state's primary human services programs. One topic recently researched concerns the extent to which programs can share data with each other. IV-D has been unable to find any legislation that provides specific data elements that IV-A requires to administer its program. The only data elements clearly identified that have been found to date are specified in AT 89-09, the certification guide, and those related to FPLS. Program officials also mentioned that they have restrictions on sharing information obtained from other state agencies and some Federal data sources. The information shared with the IV-D agency is restricted and may be used only for the purposes of establishing and enforcing support.

The legislative authority for child support can be found in 42 USC 652 Duties of the Secretary, which establish standards for State programs and 42 USC 654(4), which outlines state Child Support Enforcement plan requirements (Note: the requirements specifically reference TANF referrals to child support).

Relevant regulations include 45 CFR 303.2(a)(2) & 3(b) which addresses state AFDC/TANF cases referred to the state child support agency, 45 CFR 307.10(b)(14) which addresses the use of automated processes to assist the state in meeting state plan amendments, and 45 CFR 302.85 addresses mandatory computerized support enforcement systems.

Also available is the OCSE guideline entitled "Automated Systems for Child Support Enforcement: A Guide for States".

Finally, OCSE, in its response to comments to the final rules on computerized support enforcement systems, Federal Register August 21, 1998 (Volume 63, Page 44795-44817 ) provided a chart detailing who has access to FPLS information, for what purposes, how to gain access, what information is available and any exceptions. OCSE is currently developing a notice of proposed rulemaking on data safeguarding regulations for child support and the NPRM will also include an updated chart of the authorized uses of child support data.

## **V. Identifying Recommendations and Best Practices**

The preceding sections of this report provide information about the data shared between state TANF and CSE programs and highlight important issues concerning the data collection and exchange processes. State participants have shared valuable information about the challenges they've confronted and technical solutions they've implemented to reduce error rates and improve data quality.

In May 2004, a workgroup comprised of State-level TANF and Child Support Enforcement representatives will convene to discuss the report findings and make recommendations concerning Best Practices and next steps. Identifying Best Practices is not an easy task and requires careful discussion and reflection. For example, some consideration should be given the fact that several factors influencing data collection that states highlighted will most likely not disappear in the near future. Staff turnover, a significant concern for larger jurisdictions, will likely remain an issue. Although turnover rates may decrease during economic

## DRAFT

downswings, the fact that social service positions are highly stressful and on the lower end of the pay scale will continue to ensure that staff turnover will be a factor.

Program resources, another factor, will most likely not increase significantly in the future. In fact, programs will probably face the threat of decreased resources if state budget deficits continue. High worker caseload levels will also continue to be a factor until staff turnover decreases and resources improve. And training programs, although worthwhile, can be a drain on limited resources and logistically challenging to administer. As a result, training may not always be a viable option. Ultimately, workgroup members will be asked to select ideas that have the best potential to improve, in the long run, the data exchange process and achievement of state performance measures after considering the factors highlighted in this report and elsewhere. Some of the questions that the workgroup will be asked to consider are identified here.

- Do the data element requirements defined in AT 89-09 need to be modified? Given the feedback provided by program officials, the data elements identified in AT 89-09 seem to meet current IV-D program needs. Is more consideration needed or is AT89-09 satisfactory ?
- What level of communication between IV-A and IV-D technical and programmatic staff is best? An established forum to discuss programmatic changes and system modifications seems to foster synchronization between programs and synchronization between programmatic change and corresponding system modifications. Should States consider implementing focus groups involving local district staff similar to the Nebraska model previously mentioned?
- What recommendations, if any, should be made regarding the use of training to improve data collection efforts and reducing error rates? Some states seem to focus on training, while others do not. Are there circumstances which clearly favor the use of training solutions, as opposed to technical solutions, to improve the data collection and sharing process?
- Should states consider utilizing methods that foster greater technical commonality between their IV-A and IV-D systems? For example, Maryland approached the development of its integrated system using a common vendor to design, build, and maintain the TANF and CSE modules. The ability of any state to implement this would seem to depend on a host of factors including procurement rules, existing levels of program collaboration, technical considerations, resources, etc. Can efficiencies be realized when greater commonality is achieved between systems?
- Some states have moved toward an electronic-only referral format; is this a practice that other states should work toward? States will need to consider multiple factors like existing technical capacity and process design, and may require long-term planning because of resource and technical limitations. Benefits seem to include the reduction of a two-step process that fosters errors and greater system-based control of the data collection process. If both paper

**DRAFT**

and electronic referral methods are used simultaneously, should states adopt quality controls like ones implemented by Nebraska, Washington, or Pennsylvania to ensure a one-to-one match?

- What recommendations, if any, should be made regarding the ability of IV-A and IV-D staff to have access to the other's data?
- How can the problem associated with miscoding be best addressed? Miscoding is a common occurrence in part because there are too many codes to manage. Should States consider the Pennsylvania approach of looking at the "net effect" to determine what codes are really necessary?
- Would the amount of data collected by IV-A affect IV-D program performance? More data does not necessarily mean that program outputs and outcomes will improve. Wisconsin suggested that less data could be collected by IVA staff and program goals could still be achieved.
- Do system controls have the potential to improve the data collection process? States such as Maryland and Montana are establishing a minimum level of data collection that suspends the TANF eligibility or benefit issuance process if the worker fails to enter all the required information. Should these methods be recommended to other states who are looking for ways to improve data collection results?
- What recommendations should be made concerning the TANF clearance and certification process? Theoretically, both programs could benefit if technical improvements that increase the likelihood that person searches will be successful can be developed. States like Wisconsin and Nevada are currently designing and implementing solutions.

**DRAFT**

## **VI. Appendix**



**DRAFT**

***A. Appendix A - DCL 03-28 document***

OCSE-DCL-03-28

OFA-DCL

DATE: 07/11/2003

TO: State IV-A & IV-D Directors

Dear Colleague:

Are your local IV-A and IV-D offices working together to serve families on TANF?

Dedicated Child Support and TANF workers across the nation have contributed to the success of welfare reform by helping clients toward paid employment and supplementing their earnings with child support. The combination of job earnings and child support is key to helping low-income families become and remain self-sufficient. Nearly half the families leaving TANF depend on child support payments for about one-third of their budgets. It is critical that *all* local IV-A and IV-D offices work together on TANF cases.

We therefore ask you, state directors, to examine together whether the links between your Child Support and TANF programs are adequate to assure:

- Full, accurate and prompt child support payments as families exit TANF;
- Improved transfers of information between IV-A and IV-D workers achieved through mutual redesign of automated systems;
- Timely and accurate referrals from IV-A to IV-D so that court orders for child support can be promptly obtained;
- IV-D agencies expediting cases at the request of TANF workers when consistent payment of child support might close a TANF case or prevent a return to TANF dependency;
- Accurate and timely transmittal of TANF data to facilitate achievement of state IV-D performance measures;
- TANF clients better educated on services they can expect from the Child Support Office, and on the importance of updating their addresses to assure timely payment of child support.

**DRAFT**

Regular interaction between your local IV-A and IV-D offices is key to providing both optimum customer service and meeting state performance measures. Inaccurate TANF information may prevent a state from meeting required IV-D performance measures, and thereby, reduce the amount of its TANF grant. If an audit determines that a state has submitted incomplete or inaccurate data, and the state fails to correct the data and meet the related performance standards in the following year, the state will not be awarded IV-D incentive payments and will be subject to a penalty of one to five percent of its TANF grant.

We urge you to jointly monitor and assess the quality of ongoing collaborations between IV-A and IV-D throughout your state. As needed, please assist your local offices to implement processes that expedite collaborative services of TANF cases on a regular basis. It is also important that you provide your local Child Support and TANF workers with joint training in collaborative operations.

To help you undertake this initiative, we have contracted for the development and field testing of a training curriculum on collaborative approaches to client services. This will be designed as a joint course for Child Support, TANF, and Workforce Development staffs at state and local levels. We expect the curriculum to be available to the states by this fall.

Attached are “Collaboration Strategies” providing examples of ways in which states have been collaborating between IV-A and IV-D programs. Our offices shared these strategies with you earlier this year, and they may assist your efforts in the period ahead.

In summary, we urge the IV-A and IV-D directors in each state to work together on Child Support/TANF issues and develop joint strategies to improve them. In doing so, we assure you of our unified commitment to assist your efforts. Our Regional Offices invite your calls for assistance. We encourage you to share with us your promising approaches to collaboration, which we will circulate for replication. Finally, we thank you for your renewed commitment to improve the lives of children and families through effective IV-A / IV-D collaboration.

Sincerely,

Sherry Z. Heller, Ed.D.  
Commissioner  
Office of Child Support Enforcement

Andrew Bush  
Director  
Office of Family Assistance

Enclosure

**DRAFT**

***B. Appendix B - AT 89-09 document***

ACTION TRANSMITTAL  
OCSE-AT-89-09  
May 18, 1989

TO:IV-A and IV-D Agencies

SUBJECT:Revised Minimum Data Elements Required for Certifiable  
FAMIS and CSE Systems Interface

RELATED

REFERENCE:45 CFR 235.70; 45 CFR 302.31(a); 45 CFR 302.32; 45  
CFR 303.80(e); 45 CFR 303.80(f)

PURPOSE:To encourage more complete and accurate information  
exchange between the IV-A and IV-D programs.

BACKGROUND:The Family Support Administration (FSA) has been  
working to improve the interface between IV-A  
and IV-D. The success of both programs is  
dependent on the quality of cooperation and  
coordination between the two programs. The  
interface requirements in this Action  
Transmittal (AT) will assist greatly in  
promoting the effectiveness of both programs.

INSTRUCTIONS:The Child Support Enforcement System (CSES) and  
the Family Assistance Management Information  
System (FAMIS) must have the capacity to  
exchange routinely the data elements as outlined  
in this AT in order to obtain or continue to  
maintain certified status of the systems. The  
interface requirements have been condensed  
significantly and supersede the requirements in  
the FAMIS Update (FSA-FAMIS-88-01). States are  
encouraged to capture and report more  
information than what is identified in the list  
if they deem it necessary. Several new data  
elements have been added to this submittal. We  
have also identified data elements that the CSES  
must have the capacity to pass to FAMIS.

Certified FAMIS and Child Support Enforcement Systems that have  
been developed under enhanced funding which  
require changes due to the IV-A/IV-D interface  
requirements will be funded at the enhanced  
level and States will be required to submit a  
new Advanced Planning Document (ADP) for the  
modifications. States currently in the  
development of FAMIS and CSES will be required  
to submit an APD amendment for the interface  
modifications.

**DRAFT**

For States approved for regular match rate, funds will be available for IV-A systems at the IV-A rate and IV-D systems at the IV-D rate.

SUPERSEDED

MATERIAL:FSA-FAMIS-88-01, dated August 1, 198, is superseded by this transmittal.

EFFECTIVE

DATE:May 18, 1989

INQUIRIES TO:FSA Regional Administrators

Catherine Bertini  
Acting Assistant Secretary

Attachments: IV-A/IV-D Referral Data Elements  
IV-A/IV-D referral Data Elements Definitions

**DRAFT**

IV-A/IV-D REFERRAL DATA ELEMENTS

DATA ELEMENTS	DATA	DATA
	SENT FROM IV-A TO IV-D	SENT FROM IV-D TO IV-A
<u>Applicant to Recipient:</u>		
Name .....	x	x
Address .....	x	
AFDC Case Identification Number .....	x	x
Case Status (Open, Closed, Suspended) ..	x	
AFDC Grant Amount & Approval Date .....	x	
Good Cause/Noncooperation .....	x	x
Assignment of Rights .....	x	
<u>Absent Parent (AP):</u>		
Name .....	x	x
Social Security Number .....	x	
Date of Birth .....	x	
Paternity Established: Yes/No .....		x
Social Security Number .....	x	
Child no longer resides w/Recipient ....		x
Health/Medical Insurance w/AP: Yes/No .	x	
a) Name of Carrier .....	x	
b) Policy Number .....	x	
<u>Support Obligation:</u>		
Date Support Amount Estab./Modified ....	x	
Court Order Number .....	x	
Amount of Support Ordered/Modified .....	x	x
Payment Frequency (Monthly, Weekly) ....	x	x
Payments Made .....	x	x
a) through Court/IV-D agency		
b) directly to Recipient:		
1) monies retained by recipient		
2) " turned over to Court/IV-D		
Date of Last Payment/Collection .....	x	x
Amount of Last Payment/Collection .....	x	x
Excess Amount Distributed to Recipient .		x
Date Excess Distributed to Recipient ...		x

**DRAFT**

DATA ELEMENTS

DEFINITIONS

Applicant/Recipient

Name

First, middle, maiden and last name of individual responsible for, or having temporary or legal custody of, a dependant child

Address

Place of residence of custodial parent

AFDC CASE Identification No.

The identification assigned to the record reflecting all members of the case

Case Status

Identifies the current status of the case (i.e. open; closed; pending; etc.)

AFDC Grant Amount

Identifies the date upon which the IV-A application was approved for a grant

Good cause/  
Noncooperation

Indicates whether the applicant has good cause for not providing information on the absent parent or whether the applicant is not cooperating

Assignment of Rights

An eligibility requirement for AFDC whereby the applicant/recipient must assign to the State all support rights he or she may have in their behalf or in behalf of a dependent child

Absent Parent (AP):

Name

Identifies the first, middle and last name of the individual who is absent from the home and is legally or allegedly responsible for providing financial support for a dependent child

Social Security Number

Identifies the social security number of the absent parent

**DRAFT**

DATA ELEMENTS

DEFINITIONS

Date of Birth

Identifies the date of birth of the absent parent

Last Known Address

Identifies the last known address of the absent parent

Living with Recipient: Yes/No

Indicates if absent parent is living with applicant/recipient

Child No Longer resides With Recipient: Yes or No

Identifies the name and address of the last known employer of the absent parent

Health/Medical Insurance w/AP: Yes/No

Indicates if the absent parent had medical insurance coverage for the dependent child

Name of carrier

Identifies the carrier of the medical insurance available to the child(ren)

Policy Number

Identifies the policy number of the medical insurance available to the child(ren)

Support Obligation

Date Support Established/Modified

Identifies the date on which the support order was entered or modified

Court Order Number

Identification number assigned by the court which relates to the support order

Amount of support Ordered/Modified

Indicates the amount the court ordered the absent parent to pay

Payment Frequency

Indicates the frequency with which the obligation is due (i.e. weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly)

Payments Made To:

Indicates whether payments are made through the court/IV-D agency or directly to the

**DRAFT**

DATA ELEMENTS

DEFINITIONS

Date of Last  
Payment/Collection

recipient and if made to the recipient were the monies retained or turned over to the court/IV-D agency

Indicates the date the last support payment was received by the applicant or collected by the IV-D agency

Payment/Collection

Indicates the amount of the last support payment made to the applicant or collected by the IV-D agency

Excess Amount Distributed to  
Recipient

Indicates if an amount in excess of the support order was received and distributed to the recipient

Date Excess Distributed to  
Recipient

Indicates the date the excess amount was distributed to the recipient



**DRAFT**

***Appendix C - Interview Questions and Follow-up Questions***

**IV-A / IV-D Interface Interview Questions**

1. What data in addition to the minimum data elements specified in AT 89-09 do you exchange / share? (review data elements in 89-09 with participant)
2. Is there CP or NCP data collected but not currently shared by IV-A that would enhance your ability to achieve program goals?
3. Is there CP or NCP data not currently collected that would enhance your ability to achieve program goals?
4. Are there regulatory restrictions that limit the data that can be shared between the programs?
5. Can the quality of data exchanged with IV-A be improved?
6. What impediments do you need to resolve in order to improve the quality of data exchanged with IV-A? Have you planned or enacted any technical solutions to reduce or eliminate the effect of these impediments?
7. What technical solutions have you planned or enacted that improved the level of collaboration between IV-A and IV-D?
8. Have the solutions you have implemented been successful? How?
9. Have you implemented any technical solutions that have increased the number of IV-A families receiving child support or the amount of support that the IV-A families receive? Was the technical solution a result of programmatic change or process re-engineering? Has the solution reduced the number of IV-A cases?
10. Some of the problems previously identified with IV-D / IV-A data exchange include:
  - Inadequate training or on-site information for IV-A staff regarding why data is collected or the benefits of collaboration;
  - IV-A workers do not collect all the information needed from the CP regarding the NCP;
  - Incorrect coding.Have you encountered any of these problems? Has your agency implemented any technical solutions to reduce or eliminate their effect?
11. Did your agency design the IV-D system interface in collaboration with IV-A program staff?

Or

Is your IV-D system integrated with the IV-A system? Did staff from both programs collaborate on the design?
12. Are there any differences in the issues concerning IV-A and IV-D data exchange or collaboration between large jurisdictions and small jurisdictions in your state?

**IV-A / IV-D Interface Interview Follow-Up Questions**

1. Describe technical (I.e., Information Technology based) issues and corresponding solutions implemented by your state that have improved IV-A / IV-D data sharing and / or data quality. Types of technical solutions might involve enhancements to hardware, software, software development methods, etc. Some examples of improved data sharing / data quality might include: real-time electronic notification of TANF status, electronically updating NCP/CP contact information, system-guided data collection, etc.

**DRAFT**

2. Most states have cited non-technical (e.g., people oriented) issues concerning IV-D data collected by large jurisdictions versus small to medium jurisdictions. But what about the technical factors governing data exchange - are there technical issues or solutions that distinguish large jurisdictions from small to medium jurisdictions in your state?
3. Do IV-D staff have some method of access to IV-A data (other than the data elements cited in AT 89-09)? If yes, how do they access this information?
4. Can the quality of the IV-D-related data collected by IV-A be improved? Explain.
5. Are there any issues that arise for IV-D as a result of the IV-A registration / clearance process?
6. Estimate the portion of all TANF-related IV-D referrals received during a typical month that involve CPs already known to the IV-A system: Low (0% to 25%), Medium (26% to 50%), Medium High (51% to 75%), High (76% to 100%) ?
7. Estimate the portion of all TANF-related IV-D referrals received during a typical month that involve NCPs already known to the IV-A system: Low (0% to 25%), Medium (26% to 50%), Medium High (51% to 75%), High (76% to 100%) ?

*D. Appendix D - Systems Overview by State*

<u>State</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>System Name</u>	<u>Implemented</u>	<u>Technical Specifications</u>
<b>Florida</b>	IV-D	Florida On-Line Recipient Integrated Data Access system (FLORIDA)	1991	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Other Hardware Platform: IBM System 390 Operating System: OS390 Languages: COBOL; Telon; Assembler; Easytrieve DBMS: IDMS
	IV-A	Florida On-Line Recipient Integrated Data Access system (FLORIDA)	1991	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Other Hardware Platform: IBM System 390 Operating System: OS390 Languages: COBOL; Telon; Assembler; Easytrieve DBMS: IDMS
<b>Louisiana</b>	IV-D	Louisiana Automated Support Enforcement System (LASES)	1994	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: IBM – CMOS Processor Operating System: OS/390 Languages: Natural (Software AG) DBMS: ADABAS (Software AG)
	IV-A	Louisiana Automated Management Information (LAMI)	1993	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: IBM – CMOS Processor Operating System: OS/390 Languages: Natural (Software AG) DBMS: Adabas (Software AG)
<b>Maryland</b>	IV-D	Client Information System / Child Support Enforcement System (CIS)	1994	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Distributed Hardware Platform: IBM S(390) G5 Mainframe, 6 IBM 2 way P660s Operating System: OS/390, AIX Windows 2000, Linux, Novel, Websphere Languages: COBOL, J2EE, Perl, REXX DBMS: DB2, UDB, Access

**DRAFT**

<u>State</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>System Name</u>	<u>Implemented</u>	<u>Technical Specifications</u>
	IV-A	Client Information System / Client Automated Resource and Eligibility System (CIS)	1994	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: IBM S(390) G5 Mainframe, 6 IBM 2 way P660s Operating System: OS/390, AIX Windows 2000, Linux, Novel, Websphere Languages: COBOL, J2EE, PERL, REXX DBMS: DB2, UDB, Access
Montana	IV-D	System for the Enforcement and Recovery of Child Support (SEARCHS)	1993	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Client Server Hardware Platform: MVS/OS-operating platform MVS COBOL-language Operating System: Mainframe 3270 Languages: COBOL, CULPRIT DBMS: IDMS
	IV-A	The Economic Assistance Management System (TEAMS)	1991	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Client Server Hardware Platform: IBM Operating System: Mainframe 3270 Languages: COBOL, CULPRIT DBMS: IDMS
Nebraska	IV-D	Children Have A Right To Support (CHARTS)	1998	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Client Server Hardware Platform: 9672 R 36 IBM processors Operating System: NT 4.0 – client Windows 2000 servers Languages: PowerBuilder - On-line Visual Basic - On-line COBOL - batch DBMS: DB2 - EnterpriseDB2 v. 6 OX/390Client Server - DB2 v. 5.2 (in field)
	IV-A	Nebraska Family Online Client User System (N-FOCUS)	1996	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Client Server Hardware Platform: IBM Operating System: OS390 CICS Languages: COBOL; Assembler; C; Java (some online code generated by CA COOL:Gen and CA AION tools) DBMS: DB2

**DRAFT**

<u>State</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>System Name</u>	<u>Implemented</u>	<u>Technical Specifications</u>
Nevada	IV-D	Nevada Operations of Multi-Automated Data Systems (NOMADS)  Note: NV adopted INRHODES and rewrote the code using a different language (CSP).	1999 (CSE non-TANF data entry)	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: Mainframe Operating System: OS/390 Languages: CSP DBMS: DB2
	IV-A	Nevada Operations of Multi-Automated Data Systems (NOMADS)	2000	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: Mainframe Operating System: OS/390 Languages: CSP DBMS: DB2
Pennsylvania	IV-D	Pennsylvania Automated Child Support Enforcement System (PACSES)	1999	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: Unisys Mainframe WAN/LAN Operating System: OS-2000; Windows NT ; Windows 2000XP 5.0 SP.3 Languages: ACOB – ASCII COBOL DBMS: UDSC; DMS-2200; RDMS-2200; UREP, IRU
	IV-A	Client Information System (CIS)	1992	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: UNISYS Clear Path Enterprise Server Operating System: OS 2200 Languages: COBOL DBMS: Universal Data System (UDS)
Rhode Island	IV-D	Integrated Rhode Island System (INRHODES)	1991	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: IBM Operating System: OS/390; VTAM; TSO; JES2; NCP Languages: Natural; CICS; CICS COBOL DBMS: ADABAS

**DRAFT**

<u>State</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>System Name</u>	<u>Implemented</u>	<u>Technical Specifications</u>
	IV-A	Integrated Rhode Island System (INRHODES)		Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: IBM Operating System: OS/390; VTAM; TSO; JES2; NCP Languages: Natural; CICS; CICS COBOL DBMS: ADABAS
Washington	IV-D	Support Enforcement Management System (SEMS)		Type of Application: Multiple database Type of Platform: Multiple Platform Hardware Platform: UNISYS Mainframe; File, web, and database servers. Operating System: OS 2200, Win2000 Languages: COBOL, Visual Basic DBMS: DMS 1100, SQL
	IV-A	Automated Client Eligibility System (ACES)	1997	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: Mainframe and Server Operating System: OS 390; MS Windows NT; MS Windows 2000; IBM Websphere Languages: Cobol; Java; Java script; DYL280; Assembler DBMS: IMS; DB2 OS/390; DB2 UDB
Wisconsin	IV-D	Kids Information Data System (KIDS)	1996	Type of Application: Multiple Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: Mainframe CPU-Amdahl G52098E Operating System: OS/390; CICS Languages: Cobol for MVS; SAS DBMS: DB2
	IV-A	Client Assistance for Re-employment & Economic Support (CARES)	1994	Type of Application: Single Database Type of Platform: Single Platform Hardware Platform: Amdahl Operating System: OS/390 Languages: IMS; TSO; EOS; COBOL 2; VTAM; SAS; RACF; MVS; Netview FTP; Finalist; Quick Start; CICS; Network Data Mover DBMS: DB2

**DRAFT**

***E. Appendix E - State Agency Program Organization***

<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Program</u></b>	<b><u>Agency Organized Within</u></b>
Florida	IV-D	Department of Revenue
	IV-A	Department of Children and Families
Louisiana	IV-D	Department of Social Services, Office of Family Support
	IV-A	Department of Social Services, Office of Family Support
Maryland	IV-D	Department of Human Resources
	IV-A	Department of Human Resources
Montana	IV-D	Department of Public Health & Human Services
	IV-A	Department of Public Health & Human Services
Nebraska	IV-D	Health & Human Services
	IV-A	Health & Human Services
Nevada	IV-D	Department of Human Resources
	IV-A	Department of Human Resources
Pennsylvania	IV-D	Department of Public Welfare
	IV-A	Department of Public Welfare
Rhode Island	IV-D	Department of Administration, Division of Taxation
	IV-A	Department of Human Services
Washington	IV-D	Department of Social and Health Services
	IV-A	Department of Social and Health Services
Wisconsin	IV-D	Department of Workforce Development
	IV-A	Department of Workforce Development