



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food and
Nutrition
Service

January 2002
Food Stamp Program
Report No. FSP-02-CM

**An Assessment of Computer Matching in the Food Stamp Program
Volume I—Summary of Survey Results**

Final Report

January 2002

Authors:

William S. Borden
Robbi L. Ruben-Urm

This study was conducted under Contract number 53-3198-7-025

This report is available on the Food and Nutrition Service web site:

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane>.

Suggested Citation:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis, Nutrition and Evaluation, Fiscal Year 2001 FSP-02-CM, by William S. Borden and Robbi Ruben-Urm. Project Office, Sharron Cristofar, Alexandria, VA: 2001.

Submitted by:

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
(609) 799-3535

Project Director: William S. Borden

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Rm. 206, 3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

Project Officer: Sharron Cristofar

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communications of program information (Braille, large point, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W., Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20250-9419 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TTD) USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the contributions of the State officials who shared their time and knowledge with us, and provided us much of the information that is summarized in this report. Many thanks to Steven Carlson, Ted Macaluso, Barbara Hoffman, Carlyn Foley, Ed Speshock, and Greg Fortine. In addition to participating in the survey, the State representatives provided written documentation and were available to answer many follow-up questions.

We also thank Sharron Cristofar, the project officer from Food and Nutrition Service, who provided guidance throughout the project.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
I SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS	1
A. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
B. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	2
C. STATE CENSUS METHODOLOGY	3
D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT	5
II OVERVIEW OF STATE COMPUTER MATCHING ACTIVITIES AND METHODS	7
A. COMPUTER MATCHING-RELATED ACTIVITIES	7
1. Database Integration.....	7
2. Certification Period	9
3. Automated Case Certification and Management System (ACS)	9
4. Organizational Unit Responsible for Computer Matching.....	9
5. Selection of New Matching Systems.....	10
6. Eligibility Data Access.....	10
7. Connectivity and New Technology.....	10
8. Information Stored on the Database.....	11
9. Duplicate Participation	15
10. ABAWD Tracking	15
11. Biometrics	17
12. Inter-State Matching.....	19
13. Alien Status Inquiries	24
14. Federal Disqualified Recipient System (DRS).....	24
15. Data Brokers.....	27
B. COMPUTER MATCHING METHODS	27
1. Increased Technological Capabilities.....	27
2. Applicant and Recipient Matching.....	28

CONTENTS *(continued)*

Chapter	Page
II	
<i>(continued)</i>	
3. Strategies to Increase Match Effectiveness	31
4. Followup	33
C. DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL AND STATE MATCHING SYSTEMS	36
III SPECIFIC COMPUTER MATCHING SYSTEMS USED	39
A. OVERALL USE OF MATCHING SYSTEMS	39
1. Number of Matching Systems Used.....	39
2. Discontinued Systems	41
3. Matching Systems Planned for Future Use	44
B. DISCUSSION OF EACH MATCHING SYSTEM	44
1. Prisoner Verification System.....	44
2. Social Security Administration (SSA) Death Match.....	46
3. State Wage Information Collection Agency (SWICA).....	46
4. State Data Exchange (SDX).....	47
5. Unemployment Insurance (UI).....	47
6. Benefits Data Exchange (BENDEX)	48
7. Internal Revenue Service (IRS).....	48
8. Quarters of Coverage.....	49
9. Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports (BEERS).....	49
10. Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV).....	49
11. State New Hires.....	50
12. Child Support	50
13. State Tax Refund Offset Program (STROP)	50
14. State Prison Match	51
15. State Death Match	51
16. State Fleeing Felons	52
IV CONCLUSION	53
1. Findings: How States Use Computer Matching	53
2. Findings: Increased Technological Capabilities	55
APPENDIX A: COMPARISON OF MATCHING SYSTEMS USED IN 1991 AND 2000.....	A.1

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND CASE MANAGEMENT	8
2	INTERNET ACCESS.....	12
3	INTERNET USES	12
4	HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION ON THE CLIENT DATABASE.....	14
5	ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION PROCESSES.....	16
6	METHOD FOR VALIDATING SSNs.....	17
7	STATE USE OF BIOMETRIC TECHNOLOGY	18
8	CURRENT INTERSTATE MATCHING FOR DUPLICATE PARTICIPATION	20
9	ALIEN VERIFICATION ACTIVITIES	25
10	DISQUALIFIED RECIPIENT SYSTEM PROCESSES	26
11	FREQUENCY OF APPLICANT MATCHING.....	29
12	FREQUENCY OF RECIPIENT MATCHING	32
13	SYSTEMS USING TARGETING	34
14	TIME LAPSE BETWEEN MATCH AND RECEIPT OF MATCHED DATA BY LOCAL OFFICE.....	35
15	DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL AND STATE COMPUTER MATCHING SYSTEMS.....	37
16	COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF STATES USING EACH MATCHING SYSTEM IN 1991 AND 2000 FOR SYSTEMS USED BY TWO OR MORE STATES	40

TABLES *(continued)*

Table		Page
17	COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SYSTEMS REPORTED BEING USED BY STATES	42
18	DISCONTINUED MATCHING SYSTEMS, BY STATE	43
19	FUTURE STATE MATCHING SYSTEMS	45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results from the State census conducted by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Data for the census were collected during Fiscal Year (FY) 2001. The study examines how States are currently using or planning to use computer matching strategies for error reduction in the Food Stamp Program (FSP).

Data from an earlier census, the State Food Stamp Program Operations Update (STOPS) conducted in 1991, were used as a benchmark to compare to current computer matching activities. This study expands on the information collected in 1991 by including additional issues related to computer matching.

Since 1991, many aspects of the FSP and of computer matching have changed. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) increased State's flexibility in several areas of program operations. For example, the Income Eligibility and Verification System (IEVS) and the Systematic Alien Verification Eligibility system (SAVE) matches are now optional. General Accounting Office (GAO) studies of individuals collecting food stamp benefits simultaneously in multiple States, and those collecting benefits while incarcerated or deceased, have led to new matching requirements for States.

FINDINGS

How States Use Computer Matching

There were dramatic changes in State use of computer matching systems in the 1990s, both in terms of the number of systems used and the frequency and timeliness of matches.

- The use of computer matching systems by States has almost doubled since 1991. In 1991, the average number of systems used by States was about 7.5; it is currently about 14.
- In 1991, only three States (Florida, Illinois, and California) used more than 10 matching systems. In 2000, 45 States reported using more than 10 matching systems.

The systems that States have most frequently added to their matching programs are:

- Prisoner Verification System (mandated)—48 States, not available in 1991
- Social Security Administration (SSA) Death Match (mandate)—45 States, not available in 1991

- Disqualified Recipient System (DRS) Federal or State—44 States, not available in 1991
- Quarters of Coverage—42 States, not available in 1991
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)—34 States, 10 in 1991
- State New Hires—43 States now,¹ 2 in 1991
- Child Support—28 States now, 5 in 1991
- State Tax Refund Offset Program (STROP)—22 States now, 1 in 1991
- State Fleeing Felons—19 States now, not available in 1991

Most States continue to use the six external matching systems that comprised the original IEVS, established in 1986. As a result of PRWORA these systems are no longer mandated but they are still used because they are perceived as providing useful data. At least 48 States continue to use the State Wage Information Collection Agency (SWICA), State Data Exchange (SDX), Unemployment Insurance (UI), and Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX) matches.

Even though there was a large increase in the number of matching systems used, States also discontinued using some matching systems.

- Eighteen States indicated that they have discontinued using a total of 40 matching systems that they reported using in 1991. The States that have chosen to discontinue using systems most often have discontinued Internal Revenue Service (IRS) matches (nine States) and Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports (BEERS) matches (eight States).
- The reasons most often given for discontinuing these systems are the burdensome security requirements imposed by the IRS and the fact that the data returned from these matches often are too old to be useful.

Twenty States indicated that they plan to implement a total of 48 matching systems in the future. Five States reported that they intend to implement the State Death match, five States will be implementing the New Hires match, and three States plan on re-implementing the match with IRS.

States reported that 87 percent of matching systems used were effective for detecting fraud and abuse in the FSP. Nine percent of systems used were not useful or effective. For three percent of systems used, States reported that they did not know if they were effective. When a State indicated that it did not find a particular matching system to be useful, the reasons given pertained to outdated or erroneous data retrieved from the match.

¹This information is based on data collected by FNS after the census was completed.

Increased Technological Capabilities

Technological advances, particularly the growth in communications networks, have greatly increased State capabilities for matching. States can now send cases to be matched and can receive match results via communications networks, rather than by traditional shipping of magnetic media. These advances have led to much more rapid responses from external databases. States now have a much greater capability to initiate queries to external databases on demand from a caseworker, rather than waiting for routine batch matches.

- Thirty-eight percent of matches can now be accessed online; only 12.5 percent of matches could be accessed online in 1991.
- SSA has developed common interfaces to its various databases, such as the State Online Query System (SOLQ) and the State Verification Exchange System (SVES). Forty-three States reported using SVES.² A State may now send a single query to SSA and the case will be matched with the social security number (SSN) identity file to verify the SSN, and with the databases which contain information on SSA and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits and covered income. These interfaces thus bundle the separate matches previously conducted, such as Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), State Data Exchange (SDX), Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports System (BEERS), Numident, Quarters of Coverage, SSA Death Match, and Prison Verification System.
- There has been an increase in the level of intra-State automation. State databases such as DMV, SWICA, and UI are now linked directly to food stamp client databases. This results in a virtual integration with the food stamp client database; when queries are made to the client database regarding eligibility, the query is automatically routed to these other State databases, and the response is almost immediate.

²This information is based on data collected by FNS in August 2000.

CHAPTER I—SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

A. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This report summarizes the results from the State census conducted by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Data for the census were collected during FY 2001. The study examines how States currently use or are planning to use computer matching strategies for error reduction in the Food Stamp Program (FSP).

Since 1991, many aspects of the FSP and of computer matching have changed. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) increased State's flexibility in several areas of FSP operations. For example, the Income Eligibility and Verification System (IEVS) and the Systematic Alien Verification Eligibility system (SAVE) matches are now optional. General Accounting Office (GAO) studies of individuals collecting food stamp benefits simultaneously in multiple States, and those collecting benefits while incarcerated or deceased, have led to new matching requirements for States.

This report describes the results of a study launched by FNS to examine how States currently use or are planning to use computer matching strategies to reduce fraud and abuse in FSP. A major objective was to help improve program integrity by providing information on how States efficiently manage the FSP through the use of computer matching. To accomplish this, a State census was conducted that examined how States (1) use external databases that have been available to them for several years, and (2) use newer matching strategies that have been suggested as relevant to FSP or mandated by PRWORA. Data from the 1991 survey were used as a starting point and were expanded to include additional detail.

The findings of this study will enable States to compare their operations to those of other States. For example, if a State is considering implementing a particular matching system, it will

be able to determine which States already use this system so it can obtain technical assistance and advice from these States.

B. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

USDA funds FSP, which provides benefits to low-income households. The FNS of USDA is responsible for the development and implementation of national food stamp policy. This includes the promulgation of regulations, financial planning, review of and reimbursement for State FSP operations, and evaluation of the Program. At the State level, FSAs are responsible for administering the Program. The States are primarily responsible for determination of eligibility and benefit amounts, issuance of benefits, provision of employment and training services, and quality control.

States have flexibility within the constraints of the law and the regulations to develop their own procedures in operating the FSP and, when the need arises, to obtain waivers of regulatory provisions from USDA. State program waivers and welfare reform legislation have substantially increased State discretion and authority for making operational choices. As a result, States vary considerably on many aspects of program operations, costs, and effectiveness.

States are not only responsive to legislative requirements, but they are also very proactive in developing computer matching strategies. It has been only 15 years since the Computer Matching Act was passed. The availability of PCs and LANs on a large enough scale to be practical dates back only to the late 1980s and early 1990s. There has been a progression from batched matching, taking several months, to interactive matching, to the often real-time processing that exists today.

Computer matching is a powerful management tool that is intended to improve program integrity and efficiency. The computer matching process consists of the initial match across data files, followed by a full range of subsequent follow-up activities such as fraud prosecution,

administrative disqualification, and claims collection. Matching can take place at intake (to verify the eligibility of new applicants), at recertification (to verify the continuing eligibility of current recipients), or at some other point (to detect any inconsistencies in information on ongoing cases). States use computer matching to reduce fraud and abuse by reducing eligibility and payment error rates and to substantiate information used in prosecution.

C. STATE CENSUS METHODOLOGY

The content of this report derives from several sources. The data are based on a new data collection, supplemented by information from other FNS studies and available data. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) conducted interviews with staff in each State agency involved in food stamp computer matching. The data collection occurred from November 2000 through April 2001.

The data collection methodology was designed to minimize burden and allow for the flexibility to meet the needs of the respondents and the environment in which the data were collected. The data were obtained through a telephone interview, often with email followup. Prior to the interview, States were sent a list of topics and questions to be addressed, as well as a checklist screener. The checklist is a comprehensive listing of possible computer matching systems that States are using for the FSP. The States were asked to indicate which systems are currently being used. The list indicated which systems a State reported using in the 1991 census. State-specific questionnaires were generated based on the State's responses to the checklist. The customized questionnaire ensured that during the interview each State was asked only about computer matching systems that they have used, are currently using, or plan to use.

In the majority of States, respondents were in the information systems/programming unit of the State FSA. More than half of the interviews were conducted with only one respondent. In these cases, the respondent had gathered information prior to the interview and collected the

necessary follow-up information afterward. In a handful of States, interviews were conducted with a panel of State staff. Typically, the panel included someone from the program staff, as well as the information systems programming staff.

The interviews were structured around the following topics:

Module I	Includes general computer matching questions that are pertinent regardless of the specific matching systems employed by the State.
Overview of State Operations	Certification period and case management; Automated Certification and Case Management System (ACS).
Telecommunications and Connectivity	Internet access and use of data entry and update functions.
Database Content	How client and household characteristics are stored on the database; information on work registration status and disqualification information; flags for outstanding verification requirements related to a pending action.
Computer Matching Activities and Organization	Role and function of offices responsible for matches; selection of matching systems, validation of SSNs, verification of alien status; duplicate participation checks.
Cross-State Matches	PARIS participation, routine and nonroutine, cross-State or cross-jurisdiction matches.
Disqualified Recipient System (DRS)	State usage of the national DRS.
Able-Bodied Adults with Dependents (ABAWDS)	How States are tracking ABAWDS.
Finger Imaging	How biometrics are being used by States.
Data Brokers	Whether or not States are using data brokers.
Module II	Asks all States what, if any, changes the State has planned in computer matching. For example, it queries States about new matching programs or the discontinuation of existing programs.
Module III	Matching system-specific questions customized for each State based on the State's responses to the checklist screener.
Module IV	Includes specific matching system questions for States who discontinued a particular match as indicated on the State baseline checklist. The module contained two questions asking when and why the match was discontinued.
Module V	Information on specific matching systems that the State indicated will be used in the future.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Volume I of the report—Summary of Survey Results—contains three chapters covering States' use of computer matching systems. Following this introductory chapter, Section A of Chapter II presents the findings from the census on computer matching-related activities. Section B of Chapter II discusses the census findings on the methods used by States to conduct computer matching. Section C of Chapter II contains a description of each matching system.

Chapter III presents the findings on State use of matching systems, including the increase in systems used since 1991. It also presents the findings organized by matching system (including the number of States using each system), changes in the use of each system, and State assessments of the usefulness of each match.

Volume II, State Computer Matching Profiles, presents computer matching-related information for each State. Each profile provides a broad overview of the State's computer matching activities.

Volume III of the report, Appendix Tables, contains a series of 12 tables. These tables provide responses to selected interview questions for each State, organized by question. Also included in Volume III is a glossary of key terms used in computer matching and related eligibility-verification processes. The glossary includes a brief description of each computer matching system discussed in the report.

CHAPTER II—OVERVIEW OF STATE COMPUTER MATCHING ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study on the States' use of computer matching system activities and methods. Section A discusses computer matching activities such as program administration and case management, telecommunications and Internet connectivity, information stored on the database, eligibility-verification processes, alien status inquiries, and disqualified recipient inquiries. Section B discusses the methods States use to conduct matching, such as the timing of matching, targeting, and followup. Section C presents a description of computer matching systems most commonly used by States, as well as definitions of the key terms necessary to understand the matching process.

A. COMPUTER MATCHING-RELATED ACTIVITIES

The census of States focused primarily on the computer matching systems and processes employed by the States for food stamps. However, the survey included a number of questions about other activities related to the verification of eligibility data and the computer matching process. Program administration and case management, Internet access, alien verification, the Disqualified Recipient System (DRS), biometrics, and data brokers are some areas that will be addressed in this section. Table 1 presents the findings for the program administration and case management variables from the current census and, when available, from the 1991 census.

1. Database Integration

There has been little change in program integration since 1991. For example, 33 States reported integration with AFDC/TANF in 1991 and 35 reported integration with AFDC/TANF in 2000. Thirty-five State automated certification systems (ACSs) are integrated with at least one other public assistance database.

TABLE 1
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND CASE MANAGEMENT

	2000	1991
	Number of States	Number of States
State client database is integrated with:		
TANF (AFDC in 1991)	35	33
Medicaid	29	NA
Child Support	19	4
GA	9	17
Length of food stamp case certification*		
Less than 6 months	6	
6-12 months	37	
Greater than 1 year	6	
Length of Certification Varies		
Yes	50	
No	3	
State has an Automated Case Certification and Management System		
Yes	53	50
Percent of Eligibility Workers Who Can Access Eligibility Data*		
99-100%	51	
Less than 99%	1	
Percent of Eligibility Determinations Done Online		
99-100%	47	29
Less than 99%	6	7
Eligibility Workers Access to Historical Data		
Can access current case status only	5	5
Can access both current status and historical cases	47	31

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State Food Stamp Agencies.

*Shading indicates that the question was not asked in 1991.

*In some cases, the number of responses does not equal 53 because of nonresponse.

Twenty-nine States reported integration with Medicaid in 2000; there are no data on Medicaid integration in 1991. The number of States integrated with a State child support enforcement database increased from 4 to 19, but the number integrated with General Assistance (GA) decreased from 17 to 9.

2. Certification Period

The length of the certification period can have an influence on computer matching when matching is done at recertification. Most States reported a range of certification periods, depending on client characteristics. Thirty-seven States reported the range as between 6 and 12 months. Six States reported less than 6 months, and six States reported more than 12 months. Many States explained that older clients are the most likely to have the longest time between recertifications, since they are less likely to have changes in their status.

3. Automated Case Certification and Management System (ACS)

In 2000, every State reported having a Statewide ACS, which is a State's food stamp client database. In 1991, three States--California, Minnesota, and Montana--reported no automated client database.

4. Organizational Unit Responsible for Computer Matching

In 38 States, the responsibility for computer matching is centralized in one department or division. In the remaining States, computer matching typically is divided between two or more departments by functional area, such as fraud or claim-related matches versus eligibility-related matches. A common model in cases where the computer matching is divided is that the State's fraud and investigations unit is responsible for the Federal Tax Refund Overpayment Program (FTROP) and State Tax Refund Overpayment Program (STROP) matches, while the office of information services is responsible for the remaining matches conducted in the State.

States also divided computer-matching responsibilities by technical roles. For example, the user requirements and specifications typically are housed in the same department. The one exception to this is programming support, which typically is in a different office and in many cases is provided by an independent contractor.

5. Selection of New Matching Systems

States were asked how new matching systems are chosen for their State. Twenty-one States reported that federal and State mandates were the main reason for an increase in the number of matching systems used. Seventeen States responded that new systems are adopted as a result of a cost/benefit or benchmarking analysis. Many States also reported that, if they see a need or a hole in their matching programs, they will look for new matching system opportunities.

6. Eligibility Data Access

Fifty-one States reported that eligibility workers have online access to the client database; 47 States reported that 99 to 100 percent of eligibility determinations are done online. Forty-seven States access both current and historical data on their client database, compared to 31 States in 1991.

7. Connectivity and New Technology

Technological advances, particularly the growth in communications networks, have increased State's capabilities for matching since the STOPS data were collected in 1991. States can now send cases to be matched and can receive the match results more quickly over communications networks, rather than traditional shipping of data on magnetic media.

- Forty States reported having the capacity to transfer data electronically. The most important method used is the "Connect: Direct" network maintained by the SSA, which 28 States reported using. (Connect: Direct is a national network allows State agencies to transfer data to SSA through a single hub agency in each State.)

- The ability to transfer files electronically has led to more rapid responses from external databases. Caseworkers now have greater capability to initiate queries to external databases on demand, rather than waiting for routine batch matches to occur. Thirty-eight percent of matches can now be accessed online; only 12.5 percent of matches could be accessed online in 1991.

Tables 2 and 3 illustrate how States use the Internet. All States have Internet access; 49 of the States also provide access to their local offices. In half the States (28), all staff within the central and local offices have access, and in the other half (24 States), only selected staff have access. In most cases where only selected staff have access, States reported that management staff have access. In some States, Internet connectivity varied by county office, and some provided access on an as-needed basis or on a selected number of terminals per office.

Seven States are using the Internet for computer matching purposes. (See State Table 2 in the Appendix for a list of States.) Fourteen States reported using the Internet to obtain and confirm client data as part of the eligibility process. Seven States reported using the Internet as a tool for identity verification, and six States use the Internet for case management.

8. Information Stored on the Database

These findings address the client and household characteristics stored on the database, including:

- Financial data (earned income, unearned income, and assets)
- Information on work registration status
- Disqualification information
- Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWD) data
- Outstanding verification requirements flags relating to a pending action
- Maintenance of historical data

TABLE 2
INTERNET ACCESS

	Number of States
Number of States with Internet Access	
Central office only	4
Central and local offices	49
Staff with Internet Access*	
All	28
Selected staff only	24

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

*The number of responses does not equal 53 because of nonresponse.

TABLE 3
INTERNET USES

	Number of States
Functions the Internet Is Used for:	
Computer matching	7
Identity verification	7
Obtaining and confirming client data	14
Case management	6
Claims processes	1

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

Table 4 presents the findings for the variables relating to the types of household information stored on the client database. The large majority of States reported that social security numbers (50 States), case number (45 States), name (43 States), and date of birth (36 States) were used to identify the recipient on the client database. Other identifiers used less often are address of the household, gross earnings of the household, race, and gender. Many States explained that they use a number of different identifiers to look up data in the client database. All States store data on every individual in the household. Fifty-two States also include ineligible members of the household.

Forty-four States store work registration status, and 47 States store gross earnings by individual. Forty-one States store information on alien status. Twenty-seven States store ABAWDs exemptions in their system, and 23 store ABAWD's work history.

All States indicated that they store a great deal of additional information. "Other" elements that States reported storing are gender, sex, race, resources, assets, child care assistance, marital status, shelter costs, and educational status.

Forty-three States reported that their systems have flags to indicate outstanding verification requirements. Most States that use flags explained that they alert the caseworker that there are outstanding requirements.

All States but one (North Carolina) reported that they store information on fraud disqualifications in the system. All the States who responded, reported that they store the disqualification code. Forty-six States also store the period of disqualification, and 44 store the reason for disqualification.

Eligibility verification processes used by the States include duplicate participation checks, SSN validation, ABAWD eligibility verification, and identity verification using biometrics.

TABLE 4

HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION ON THE CLIENT DATABASE

Household Information	Number of States
Household Information Used as an Identifier of the Client Database:	
SSN of head of household	50
Case Number	45
Name of the head of the household	43
Address of Household	21
Birthdate of the head	36
Gross earnings	8
Other	23
Individuals in the Household Represented on the Database:	
Head of Household	53
Spouse of Head	53
Other Adults	53
Children	53
Nonhousehold members	46
Ineligible household members	52
Information Stored on Individuals:	
SSN	52
Individual ID	49
Name	52
Birth date	52
ABAWDs work history	23
ABAWDs Exemptions	27
Alien Status	41
Alien Quarters of Coverage	27
Gross Earnings by Individual	47
Work Registration Status	44
Gender	16
Other	53
Flags Indicating Outstanding Verification Requirements ¹	43
Information on Fraud Disqualifications	
Flag Indicating Disqualification	52
Period of Disqualification	46
Reason for Disqualification	44

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

¹In some cases the number of responses does not equal 53 because of nonresponse.

9. Duplicate Participation

As shown in Table 5, all States but one (North Dakota) that responded check for duplicate participation. Forty-three States check only when a new client applies. The remaining States perform the check at both application and recertification or on a nightly or monthly basis. Thirty-three States perform the check online, while 13 States conduct the duplicate check as a batch function.

As shown in Table 6, 50 States reported that they validated SSNs (3 did not respond to this item). Fifty of the States validated SSNs against SSA files through SVES or through the Numident or Enumeration matches. Guam reported that it verified SSNs by examining social security cards.

10. ABAWD Tracking

Determining ABAWD eligibility requires information such as prior program participation (because of time-limit provisions) and work history. The eligibility time limit for FSP ABAWDs is no more than 3 months in a 36-month period unless; (1) the individual is working at least 20 hours a week averaged monthly (2) participating in and complying with the requirements of a work program for 20 hours or more per week, or (3) participating in a workfare program. This information is not required for determining eligibility of other FSP cases. A particular impact of PRWORA on computer matching was the requirement to conduct intra-State matching of work history data for ABAWDs. State FSPs obtain data from State employment agencies on work history from wage record files. As shown in Table 5, 24 States track ABAWDs on either the client database or a stand-alone application. Thirteen States report that they track ABAWDs manually. Twenty States verify work credits for ABAWDs.

TABLE 5
ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION PROCESSES

	Yes	No
	Number of States Reporting	Number of States Reporting
Performs a Duplicate Participation Check	51	1
At application only	43	
Both application and recertification	5	
Monthly	2	
Nightly	1	
Match Access		
Batch	13	
Online	33	
Methods for Tracking ABAWDS		
Automated tracking on client database	24	
Manual tracking	13	
State Verifies Work Credits	20	24
State Uses Biometrics for FSP	4	49
State Uses Data Brokers	7	44
State Plans to Use Data Brokers in the Future	13	31
Participates in Routine Cross-State Matches	35	18
Participates in Nonroutine Matches	26	26

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

Shading indicates that questions were not “Yes” or “No” questions; responses are indicated in the first column.

TABLE 6
METHOD FOR VALIDATING SSNs

Methods	Number of States ¹
SVES	14
Numident and/or Enumeration	10
Other SSA Method	26

Source: 2000 Census

11. Biometrics

Table 7 provides information about States that currently use biometric technology. Of the nine States currently using biometric technology in public assistance programs,² four—California, New York, Arizona, and Texas—reported using finger imaging in the FSP. The four states using finger imaging reported that they chose finger imaging over other biometric technologies because of its proven reliability. Texas chose to use finger imaging based on the research available on electronic imaging systems. Finger imaging was determined to be the most reliable and affordable technology for identification verification. Arizona indicated that finger imaging was chosen because that is what the other States were using. Currently, Arizona does in-State matching only but is in the process of linking up with border States. New York reported that finger imaging was the only biometric method available, and that retinal scanning technology is too new.

¹The number of responses does not equal 53 because of nonresponse.

²For a more detailed discussion of biometrics, see “The Use of Biometric Identification to Reduce Fraud in the FSP Final Report,” April 1999.

TABLE 7

STATE USE OF BIOMETRIC TECHNOLOGY

State	Participants for Which Biometrics Are Mandatory
Arizona	FSP: All adult household members (18 years or older) TANF: All adults (18 years or older) and minor parents
California (plan for unified, Statewide system)	FSP: All adult household members (18 years or older) and minor heads of household TANF and GA ³ All adults (18 years or older)
Connecticut	TANF and GA: All adults (18 years or older)
Illinois	TANF: All adult applicants and recipients (including second and minor parents) and non-aided payees.
Massachusetts	FSP: All adult household members (18 years or older) TANF and GA: All grantees (18 years or older), including teen parents
New Jersey	GA: All adults (18 years or older)
New York	TANF, GA, and FSP: All adults (18 years or older), minor parents, and minor heads of household Age for Medicaid cases is 21
Pennsylvania	FSP: All adults (18 years or older); considering minor heads of household TANF: All adults (18 years or older); considering emancipated minors and minor parents
Texas	FSP: All adults (18 years or older) and minor heads of household TANF: All adults (18 years or older) and teen parents

SOURCE: "The Use of Biometric Identification to Reduce Fraud in the FSP."

³Temporary Aid for Needy Families (TANF) is a national public assistance program. GA is a local public assistance program.

Several States reported that they have examined finger imaging but do not currently use it. Michigan reported that it plans to implement finger imaging in the next 12 to 18 months, based on a mandate from the State legislature. Connecticut and New Jersey reported that they are conducting finger imaging but not for FSP. Illinois reported that it conducted retinal scanning for one year but discontinued it because it had not proved efficient or accurate. The State plans to conduct finger imaging in the future. A pilot is scheduled for three local offices in the next year.

12. Inter-State Matching

As shown in Table 5, 35 States reported participating in routine cross-State matches to identify persons who are collecting food stamp benefits in more than one State. Twenty-six States also reported participating in irregularly scheduled or one-time cross-State or cross-jurisdiction matches. Other matches mentioned were Tribal matches in Alaska, Washington State matches with Canada, and Connecticut matches with Puerto Rico.

Table 8 presents data on current inter-State matching practices. The table indicates the routine inter-State matches that States reported conducting; it also indicates their participation or plans to participate in the Public Assistance Information System (PARIS). The information presented is based on a combination of data sources, and represents active and passive matching activities. Twelve States not currently participating in PARIS indicated that they plan to participate within the next two years. PARIS is a periodic inter-State matching process cosponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Veterans Administration (VA). States submit caseload data to the VA, which combines all the State files and reports back to each affected State any household members that are present on other State files and their period of eligibility. PARIS also matches the State files against veterans benefits information.

TABLE 8

CURRENT INTERSTATE MATCHING FOR DUPLICATE PARTICIPATION¹

State	Conducts Routine Interstate Matching of Food Stamp Records	Frequency	PARIS Participant or Plans to Participate in Next Two Years
Alabama	No	--	--
Alaska	No	--	Planned
Arizona	California Nevada	Quarterly Annually	Yes ²
Arkansas	Planned matches with Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas	--	--
California	Border counties in Nevada (El Dorado, Alpine, Nevada)	--	Yes
Colorado	Unknown	--	Planned
Connecticut	Massachusetts	Quarterly	Yes
Delaware	Pennsylvania New Jersey Maryland	-- -- --	--
District of Columbia	Maryland	--	--
Florida	New York New Jersey Georgia	Annually	Yes
Georgia	Florida	--	--
Guam	Northern Marianas	--	--
Hawaii	No	--	--
Idaho	No	--	--
Illinois	Testing match with Wisconsin, Pennsylvania	--	Yes
Indiana	No	--	--
Iowa	Missouri	--	Yes

¹Information comes from two studies: (1) the 2000 State census, and (2) the "National Client Database for Means-Tested Programs."

² Has either participated in PARIS for at least one match or was a participant in the August 2, 1999 match.

TABLE 8 (continued)

State	Conducts Routine Interstate Matching of Food Stamp Records	Frequency	PARIS Participant or Plans to Participate in Next Two Years
Kansas	Missouri	--	Yes
Kentucky	No	--	Yes
Louisiana	Texas	Monthly	Planned
Maine	Massachusetts	Quarterly	Planned
Maryland	District of Columbia	--	Yes
	Pennsylvania	Quarterly	
	Delaware	--	
	Virginia	--	
	West Virginia	--	
Massachusetts	Connecticut	Quarterly	Yes
	Maine	--	
	New York	--	
	Rhode Island	--	
	New Jersey	--	
	Florida	--	
	Puerto Rico	--	
	New Hampshire	Monthly	
Michigan	No	--	Planned
Minnesota	No	--	--
Mississippi	Planned match with Arkansas	--	--
Missouri	Kansas	--	Yes
	Iowa		
Montana	Unknown	--	Planned
Nebraska	Unknown	--	Yes
Nevada	Arizona	--	Planned
	Border counties with California		
New Hampshire	Massachusetts	Monthly	--
New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Quarterly	Yes
	Delaware	--	
	New York	--	
	Massachusetts	--	
	Maryland	--	

TABLE 8 (continued)

State	Conducts Routine Interstate Matching of Food Stamp Records	Frequency	PARIS Participant or Plans to Participate in Next Two Years
New Mexico	Texas (border counties) (has access to Texas automated client database. Dona Ana and Southern Dona Ana offices have direct access to information on active cases in Texas. Plans are to add Curry, Eddy, Roosevelt, and Lea offices. Also matches active FS clients with active expedited service clients in Utah	Quarterly	Planned
New York	Massachusetts Pennsylvania Virginia Florida Puerto Rico New Jersey Connecticut Maryland North Carolina Vermont Ohio (planned)	Quarterly -- -- -- -- -- Semi-annually -- -- -- --	Yes
North Carolina	New York	--	Yes
North Dakota	Unknown	--	--
Ohio	New York (planned)	--	Yes in 1997
Oklahoma	Texas Arkansas	--	Yes
Oregon	No	--	--
Pennsylvania	Delaware Maryland New Jersey New York Florida Illinois	Quarterly Semi-annually Quarterly Semi-annually Monthly --	Yes
Puerto Rico	Massachusetts New York	-- --	--
Rhode Island	Massachusetts	--	Planned
South Carolina	North Carolina	--	--
South Dakota	Unknown	--	Planned
Tennessee	Texas	--	Yes

TABLE 8 (continued)

State	Conducts Routine Interstate Matching of Food Stamp Records	Frequency	PARIS Participant or Plans to Participate in Next Two Years
Texas	Louisiana	--	Yes
	Oklahoma	--	
	New Mexico	--	
Utah	Matches active FS clients with active expedited service clients in New Mexico	--	--
Vermont	New York	--	--
Virgin Islands	No	--	Planned
Virginia	Maryland	--	Yes
Washington	Oregon	--	Yes
West Virginia	Maryland	--	--
Wisconsin	Testing match with Illinois and Iowa	--	Planned
Wyoming	No	--	--

13. Alien Status Inquiries

States may verify alien status for non-U.S. citizens who apply for food stamps. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) maintains the Systematic Alien Verification Eligibility (SAVE) system, which is used by federal and State agencies that administer entitlement programs to verify alien status. Table 9 summarizes States' alien verification activities.

Forty-three States use SAVE to verify alien status, which is the same as in 1991. In addition, the number of States that prefer to use the telephone to submit SAVE inquiries has changed little since 1991. There are two types of SAVE inquiries. Primary verification inquiries are done using the automated phone-in system. Secondary verification entails sending a form to INS; it is used when a discrepancy is found between the information received through the primary inquiry and the information provided by the applicant, or when more information is required. Most States, however, were unable to provide information on the number of each type of inquiry they initiate.

Thirty-two of the States that use SAVE use the telephone for submitting SAVE inquiries. Electronic file transfer was the next most popular (six States). In 30 States, SAVE inquiries are coordinated with inquiries for other programs. Maryland is the only State that reported it does not verify alien status.

14. Federal Disqualified Recipient System (DRS)

Table 10 presents the findings for the variables relating to the use of the federal Disqualified Recipient System (DRS). The DRS is a federal database maintained by FNS which lists FSP disqualifications from each State. States can query the system to determine whether an applicant has been disqualified in another State.

TABLE 9
ALIEN VERIFICATION ACTIVITIES

	2000	1991
Use of SAVE	Number of States	Number of States
Use SAVE for Verifying Alien Status	43	43
Methods for Submitting SAVE Inquiries:		
Tape	1	3
Electronic file transfer	6	3
Telephone	32	33
SAVE Inquiries Coordinated with Inquiries for Other Programs	30	

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

Shading indicates that the question was not asked in 1991.

In some cases, the number of responses does not equal 53 because of nonresponse.

TABLE 10
DISQUALIFIED RECIPIENT SYSTEM PROCESSES

DRS Processes	Number of States	
	Yes	No
State Uses DRS for:		
Penalties	37	
Eligibility	36	
Quality control	28	
States Can Provide Eligibility Workers with Direct Access to DRS	11	8
Local Offices Will Access DRS through:		
Mainframe	21	
Internet	6	
Other	6	
Don't know	19	
State's Review of DRS Edit Reports:		
As received	3	
Monthly	19	
Do not review	3	
Other	3	
State Has Its Own DRS Database	35	13
State Has Problems Obtaining DRS Verification from Other States	13	26
Response Time from Other States for DRS Inquiries:		
1-2 Days	12	
3-6 days	4	
7-14 days	3	
15-30 days	6	
Other	2	

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

Shading indicates that questions were not "Yes" or "No" questions and responses are indicated in the first column.

In some cases, the number of responses does not equal 53 because of nonresponse.

More than half of all States reported using the DRS for penalties (37), eligibility (36), and quality control (28). Of the States not currently using the DRS for eligibility, 11 answered that they could provide eligibility workers with direct access; the rest answered no, or do not know, to this question, often citing their need to see more specific requirements before they could answer whether or not they would be able to provide access.

Nineteen States indicated that they do not know how the local offices will access DRS. Of the States able to answer, 21 reported that the local offices are accessing or will access the DRS through the mainframe, and 6 said they plan to use the Internet.

Thirty-five States maintain their own disqualification database. Thirteen States indicated that they have problems obtaining DRS verification from other States. The reasons given include: the telephone contact information on the DRS files is erroneous (two States), the length of time it takes for some States to respond (four States), and bad disqualification data (one State).

15. Data Brokers

Seven States indicated that they currently are using data brokers. Data brokers sell commercial databases, such as those used by credit agencies containing financial information on individuals. Thirteen States reported that they plan to use data brokers in the near future.

B. COMPUTER MATCHING METHODS

1. Increased Technological Capabilities

A technological trend is the integration of matching systems and databases. This integration trend takes several forms:

- States often report an increase in automated linkages between State databases within a State. State databases--such as the DMV, SWICA and UI databases--are now often linked directly with the food stamp client database. This results in a “virtual integration” with the food stamp client database. When a query is made to the food stamp client database regarding eligibility, it is automatically routed to these other State databases, and the response is almost immediate.
- SSA has developed common interfaces to its various databases, such as the State Online Query System (SOLQ) and the State Verification Exchange System (SVES). Forty-three States reported using SVES.⁴ A State may now send a single query to SSA and the case will be matched with the social security number (SSN) identity file to verify the SSN, and with the databases which contain information on SSA and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits and covered income. These interfaces thus bundle the separate matches previously conducted, such as Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), State Data Exchange (SDX), Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports System (BEERS), Numident, Quarters of Coverage, SSA Death Match and Prison Verification System.
- A final form of integration is client-pooling of cases to be matched. In these situations, the pool of cases to be matched is selected from more than one program, and the results are shared across each participating program. The most commonly reported programs with which States share matches are the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program (86 percent), Medicaid (77 percent), Child Support (38 percent), and General Assistance (32 percent). Eighteen percent of the States also reported sharing with additional assistance programs. Some other programs mentioned were: Interim Assistance (8 percent), Refugee Assistance (11 percent), SSI (11 percent), Long Term Care Program (1 percent), Low Income Energy (15 percent), and Aid to the Needy Blind (6 percent).

2. Applicant and Recipient Matching

Front-end (applicant) matching is conducted as part of the eligibility process. Application is the first step in the eligibility process. Table 11 illustrates the percentage of systems that conduct applicant matching at various frequencies. States with access to online matches are more likely to conduct matching at application, since it can be done instantaneously.

States often use both online inquiries and batch inquiries for a single matching system. In other words, they conduct a monthly batch match with IRS, after which the system is updated.

⁴This information is based on data collected by FNS in August 2000.

TABLE 11
 FREQUENCY OF APPLICANT MATCHING

When Matching Occurs	Percent of All State Systems
At Application (Varies Based on Caseload)	48
Overnight	2
Two to Seven Days	5
Monthly	22
Quarterly or Longer	2
Ad hoc	3
TOTAL	82

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

The total responses do not equal 100 percent because of nonresponse.

During the month, States query the IRS system for new applicants and recertifications. They refer to this as “online matching.” Thus, many States’ responses to how long after application or recertification matches are conducted is: monthly, online (real time for new applicants and recertifications), or ad hoc (whenever someone decides to initiate a query).

For States that routinely match the entire caseload, applicant matching does not necessarily occur immediately. The proximity of the match to the application point depends on where the application date falls within the routine cycle. Some States explained that it is difficult to say exactly when the applicants are matched because they are done individually by the eligibility caseworker, who can be slowed down by a heavy workload. This particularly affects the interactive online matches where there is no regular interval for conducting the matches, and the timing is, instead, dependent on the caseworker’s schedule. Caseload could affect batch matches as well, though, if the batch is run relatively frequently. For example, if FSP recipients are matched to State UI records twice a month and, due to a backlog, several applicants do not get matched for three weeks, they miss the first biweekly match cycle.

Applicant matching is conducted during the eligibility process or at application for 48 percent of the matching systems that States are using. Two percent are matched overnight. Another 22 percent of the matching systems are matched monthly for applicants. For two percent of systems, the match is performed less frequently than monthly. For the remaining eight percent of systems for which information is available, the matching is done on demand through ad hoc query capabilities (three percent) or within one week (five percent).

The timing of recipient matching varies more than the timing of applicant matching. Seventeen percent of the recipient matches occur at recertification, 39 percent occur monthly, 10 percent occur quarterly, and the remainder occur at other intervals, the most common being within one day, annually, and ad hoc. In six percent of systems, matching is done at other

intervals--weekly, bimonthly, every three years, eight times a year, and so on. Table 12 illustrates the percentage of systems that conduct recipient matching at various frequencies.

3. Strategies to Increase Match Effectiveness

Targeting is the process of selecting cases for follow-up activities based on thresholds for discrepancies between information provided by the client and information received from the match. For example, a dollar amount threshold may be established for the IRS match in which only cases where there are earnings greater than \$5,000 are followed up. Reporting is the process of transmitting the information obtained from the match to the local office for followup. A variant of targeting can occur before or after a match is conducted. Targeting that occurs prior to the match is often referred to as “screening.” Screening is the process of selecting cases not to be matched based on household and/or individual characteristics.

Twenty-six States have implemented targeting strategies for applicant matching, and 32 States use some type of targeting strategies for recipient matching. From the standpoint of matching systems, 15 percent of applicant matching systems involve targeted matching, as do 19 percent of recipient matching systems.

States use targeting primarily for matching systems that provide income data. Income thresholds and discrepancies between reported and matched amounts are the most common type of targeting conducted. Not surprisingly, the Income Eligibility Verification Systems (IEVS) systems, all of which match income data and program benefit data, are the ones most likely to be targeted by States. These matches are described in Section C of this chapter. SWICA is the system most often targeted (24 States target recipients), followed by UI (20 States target recipients), IRS (15 States target recipients), BEERS (15 States), and BENDEX (9 States). Other

TABLE 12
 FREQUENCY OF RECIPIENT MATCHING

When Matching Occurs	Percent of All State Systems
At Recertification (Varies Based on Caseload)	17
Daily/Overnight	5
Monthly	39
Quarterly	10
Annually	4
Ad hoc	5
Other ⁵	6

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

The total responses do not equal 100 percent because of nonresponse.

⁵Weekly, bi-monthly, bi-annually, every three years, eight times per year, three times per year.

systems that are sometimes targeted include: Child Support, Fleeing Felons, DRS, Prisoner Verification, State New Hires, Income Tax Records, State Prison Match, and State Lottery Winners. Table 13 indicates the systems most commonly targeted and the number of States targeting.

4. Followup

Follow-up activities typically are conducted by the caseworker, eligibility worker, or field staff. In some States, the overpayments unit is responsible for handling followup of the federal and/or State Tax Refund Offset Program (FTROP and STROP).

All but one State, Wisconsin, indicated that there is no difference between the way followup is conducted for applicants and for recipients. Wisconsin indicated that there was a shorter time frame for followup of applicants.

- Prioritization refers to the process of ranking or ordering cases at the State level for subsequent followup. Seventy-three percent of States do not prioritize cases. Of the 18 percent of States that did report using prioritization, cases involving large dollar amounts, or cases with a large discrepancy between the reported and matched dollar amounts, were followed up first.

Examples of priority rules that were reported include: prioritizing based on the largest dollar discrepancies, prioritizing based on individual characteristics, and prioritizing based on timing.

Verification is the process of confirming that the data returned from the external database are correct. States indicated that they seek third-party verification on cases designated for followup that are not considered self-verifying.

TABLE 13
SYSTEMS USING TARGETING

System	Number of States Using Targeting
SWICA	24
UI	20
IRS	15
BEERS	15
BENDEX	9
Prisoner Verification System	9
State New Hires	5
State Prison Match	4
State Lottery Winners	3

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

In some cases, the number of responses does not equal 53 because of nonresponse.

Fifty percent of States report the results of the matches to the local offices with online reports. Twenty-four percent send paper reports; the remaining States typically use online alerts, rather than a full online report. An alert is displayed via a “pop-up window” on the eligibility worker’s screen. There was no significant variation in follow-up methods between reporting for applicants and for recipients, but there was slightly more variation by system. Reporting issues are not applicable to matches that are initiated at the local level, since the results come back to the local office rather than to the State.

The time it takes for match results to be returned to the local offices ranged from immediately to more than a month. Again, there was no significant variation between applicants and recipients. Table 14 indicates the time lapse between the match and when the local office receives the matched data.

TABLE 14
TIME LAPSE BETWEEN MATCH AND RECEIPT OF
MATCHED DATA BY LOCAL OFFICE

	Percent of Systems
Applicants	
1 day	77
Less than 1 week	7
Greater than 1 week	6
Monthly	3
Recipients	
1 day	66
Less than 1 week	16
Greater than 1 week	8
Monthly	3

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

In some cases, the total responses do not equal 100 percent because of nonresponse.

C. DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL AND STATE MATCHING SYSTEMS

So far, we have presented an overview of State matching activities, in order to set the stage for a more detailed analysis by type of match in the next chapter.

Table 15 contains descriptions of some of the most frequently used computer matching systems and how information derived from the matches is used for determining eligibility or disqualification.

TABLE 15

DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL AND STATE COMPUTER MATCHING SYSTEMS

Matching Systems	Description
Federally Mandated Matches	
Prisoner Verification System (PVS)	Match with SSA national prison records for identification information for incarcerated household members.
Social Security Administration (SSA) Death Match	Match with SSA national death records for identification information for deceased household members.
Federal Matches (Optional)	
State Data Exchange System (SDX)	Match with SSA Supplemental Security Income (SSI) database for SSI earnings information. This is an IEVS match.
State Wage Information Collection Agency (SWICA)	Match with State UI wage information. Employers whose employees are covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) must report to the SWICA each quarter. The wage data are 3 to 6 months old when matched. This is an IEVS match.
Unemployment Insurance (UI)	Match with State UI information on benefits provided to UI recipients each month. This is an IEVS match.
Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX)	Match with SSA Old Age and Survivor Insurance benefits, and other benefits provided under Title III of the Social Security Act. This includes (1) Master Beneficiary File (MBR) for SSA benefits, and (2) Master Earnings File (MEF) for quantifying quarters of coverage for SSA eligibility. This is an IEVS match.
Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports System (BEERS)	Match with IRS annual earnings data compiled from the IRS Form W-2, including; (1) self-employment, (2) out of State wages, (3) Federal and military wages, and (4) agricultural earnings. This is an IEVS match.
Federal Disqualified Recipient System (DRS)	Match with FNS database for identification information of applicants for food stamps who are disqualified from collecting food stamps because of program violations. Disqualification periods range from one year to permanent, depending on the number and severity of the offense.
Quarters of Coverage	Match with SSA quarterly earning file to ensure that aliens have 40 quarters of coverage/earnings.
Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Systematic Alien Verification System (SAVE)	Match with IRS database containing data on interest, dividends, and other types of unearned income to check for unreported income. These data are compiled from IRS Form 1099. This is an IEVS match.
State Matches (Optional)	
Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)	Match with DMV database for identification of applicants misreporting automobile assets.

TABLE 15 (continued)

Matching Systems	Description
New Hires	Match with State Employment Service new hire database for income information for recently hired applicants.
Child Support Match	Match with State or Federal Parent Locator Services child support database for identification information of applicants not reporting child support income.
State Prison Match	Match with State Department of Correction prison records for identification information of incarcerated household members.
State Tax Refund Offset Program (STROP)	Match with the database used for offsetting State income tax refunds to collect claims against households for over issued food stamp benefits where those claims are past due.
State Death Match	Match with State vital statistics records for purpose of identification to detect participation of deceased individuals.
Fleeing Felons	Match with State database of fleeing felons providing information on probation/parole violators who are ineligible to participate in the FSP.
Worker's Compensation	Match with worker's compensation to determine whether the individual is receiving worker's compensation.
Day Care Licenses	Match with day care licensing database for day care earnings. The lists typically include the name, address and phone number of the licensee and the home or facility, the licensed capacity, and the status and effective dates of the license. The following lists are available: adult foster care, child day care homes, child day care centers, camps, child caring institutions, child-placing agencies, children's foster homes.
State Lottery Winners	Match with State database of lottery winners for asset information.
State Workfare/Training/Education	Match with State Department of Labor database of individuals enrolled in the Workfare/Training/Education Program for eligibility and identification information.
State Payroll	Match with State payroll for earnings information for State employees.
Employees Retirement	Match with State database of public employee retirements.
Bank Match	Match with Treasury Department bank records for assets and eligibility information.
Foster Care Adoption	Match with State database of foster care providers and adoption records for identification information.
State Assessor's Records/Tax Records	Match with State Assessor's tax records for income information.
Cross-State Match	Match between two or more State client databases for the purpose of identification and disqualification information.

CHAPTER III—SPECIFIC COMPUTER MATCHING SYSTEMS USED

This chapter presents the findings of the State census for each of the different matching systems that States reported using. Section A discusses changes in the number of matching systems that States currently use, have discontinued, or plan to use in the future. Section B includes further discussion of particular matching systems and the reasons why States did or did not find them effective.

A. OVERALL USE OF MATCHING SYSTEMS

There have been many changes in States' use of computer matching systems since the STOPS study was conducted in 1991. States are using more matching systems and accessing them more quickly. States also have discontinued some matching systems that were used in 1991 and have made plans to add matching systems in the future.

For 87 percent of matching systems used, States reported that the systems are useful and effective for detecting fraud in the FSP. For nine percent of matching systems used, States indicated that they did not find them to be useful and effective. When a State indicated that it did not find a particular matching system to be useful, the reasons given pertained to outdated or erroneous data. For three percent of the systems, States did not know whether the matches were useful and effective.

1. Number of Matching Systems Used

The use of computer matching systems by States has almost doubled since 1991. In 1991, the average number of systems used by States was about 7.5; it is now 14. This large net increase in matching systems used occurred despite States discontinuing a total of 40 matches. Table 16 compares the number of States using various matching systems in 2000 and 1991.

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF STATES USING EACH MATCHING SYSTEM
IN 1991 AND 2000 FOR SYSTEMS USED BY TWO OR MORE STATES

System ^a	2000	1991
Federally Mandated Matches		
Prisoner Verification System	48	0
SSA Death Match	45	0
Federal Matches		
SWICA	51	52
SDX	50	48
UI	49	51
BENDEX	48	50
DRS	44	0
Quarters of Coverage	42	0
IRS	42	51
BEERS	40	50
State		
New Hires	34	10
DMV	43 ¹	2
Child Support	28	5
STROP	22	1
State Prison Match	22	4
State Death Match	21	2
Fleeing Felons	19	0
State Worker's Compensation	13	3
Lottery Winners	9	4
Day Care Licenses	6	0
State Workfare/Training/Education	6	0
Income Tax Records	5	0
State Drug Felons	5	0
State Assessor's Records	5	0
Public Assistance Data Exchange (PADX)	4	2
State Employees	4	8
State Retirement	4	1
Department of Rehabilitative Services	2	1
Public Assistance	2	3

Source: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

^aDefinitions of matches are presented in Chapter II, Section C.

¹This information is based on data collected by FNS after the census was completed.

Table 17 compares the number of systems being used by States in 1991 and 2000. The table also indicates the number of systems that have been added and discontinued, to explain the net change in the number of systems used.

- In 1991, only three States (Florida, Illinois, and California) used more than 10 matching systems, compared to 45 States in the 2000 census. Of those States reporting more than 10 systems, five States reported using 20 or more systems.
- Three States reported no change in the number of systems used in 1991 and 2000, even though two of these States discontinued and added the same number of systems. They were Florida (15), Illinois (24—added 2 and discontinued 2), Virginia (6—added 5 and discontinued 5).
- The largest increases in the number of systems used were by Connecticut (from 3 to 21), Massachusetts (8 to 27), Texas (6 to 20) and Montana (1 to 15).
- Only six States reported using fewer than 10 databases.

Thirty-four States continue to use six systems comprising the original IEVS even though they are no longer mandated, thus suggesting that they provide useful data. Fifty States reported using SDX, 51 States reported using SWICA, 49 reported using UI, 48 reported using BENDEX, 42 reported using IRS, and 40 reported using BEERS.

2. Discontinued Systems

Eighteen States indicated that they had discontinued the use of at least one matching system they had reported using in 1991. Table 18 shows the States that reported discontinuing matches, and which matches those were.

The most frequently reported discontinued matching systems were IRS matches (nine States) and BEERS matches (eight States). The reasons most frequently given for why these systems were discontinued were the burdensome security requirements imposed by the IRS and the fact that the data returned from these matches often are outdated or too old to be useful.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SYSTEMS REPORTED BEING USED BY STATES

State/Territory	Number of Systems in 2000	Number of Systems in 1991	Systems Added	Systems Discontinued	State	Number of Systems in 2000	Number of Systems in 1991	Systems Added	Systems Discontinued
Alabama	11	6	5	0	Montana	15	1	15	1
Alaska	11	9	5	3	North Carolina	12	8	4	0
Arkansas	10	8	6	4	North Dakota	12	6	7	1
Arizona	16	6	11	1	Nebraska	11	6	7	2
California	19	13	6	0	New Hampshire	8	6	3	1
Colorado	17	7	10	0	New Jersey	15	6	9	0
Connecticut	21	3	19	1	New Mexico	13	8	8	2
Delaware	16	10	7	1	New York	16	6	14	4
Washington, DC	14	10	4	0	Nevada	20	7	13	0
Florida	15	15	0	0	Ohio	17	5	12	0
Georgia	13	6	7	0	Oklahoma	19	8	11	0
Guam	9	6	4	1	Oregon	14	6	8	0
Hawaii	12	9	3	0	Pennsylvania	9	8	1	0
Iowa	14	9	5	0	Rhode Island	15	8	7	0
Idaho	12	8	4	0	South Carolina	17	7	11	1
Illinois	24	24	2	2	South Dakota	13	7	6	0
Indiana	14	6	8	0	Tennessee	10	8	2	0
Kansas	14	10	5	1	Texas	20	6	14	0
Kentucky	13	8	5	0	Utah	8	7	1	0
Louisiana	12	6	6	0	Virginia	6	6	5	5
Massachusetts	27	8	19	0	Virgin Islands	17	5	12	0
Maryland	9	8	7	6	Vermont	11	7	4	0
Maine	12	6	6	0	Washington	18	6	12	0
Michigan	15	7	8	0	Wisconsin	15	8	7	0
Minnesota	12	6	6	0	West Virginia	14	7	9	2
Missouri	16	7	9	0	Wyoming	13	6	7	0
Mississippi	11	6	6	1					
Average Number Per State						14.1	7.5		

TABLE 18
DISCONTINUED MATCHING SYSTEMS, BY STATE

State	Number of Discontinued Matching Systems	Matching Systems Discontinued
Alaska	3	BEERS, IRS, BENDEX
Arkansas	4	State Worker's Compensation, State Death Match, BEERS, IRS
Arizona	1	Prisoner Verification
Connecticut	1	Prisoner Verification
Delaware	1	State Prison Match
Illinois	2	Mississippi Client-to-Client, Financial Management Match
Kansas	1	State Worker's Compensation
Maryland	6	IRS, BEERS, UI, SWICA, SDX, BENDEX
Mississippi	1	IRS
Montana	1	State Worker's Compensation
North Dakota	1	State Prison Match
Nebraska	2	Prisoner Verification, BEERS
New Hampshire	1	IRS
New Mexico	2	Public Employees Retirement, IRS, BEERS
New York	4	State Payroll, STROP, BEERS, IRS
South Carolina	1	List of Food Stamp Recipients Found Guilty of Fraud
Virginia	5	IRS, BEERS, SWICA, UI, SDX
West Virginia	2	BEERS, IRS

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

3. Matching Systems Planned for Future Use

Of the 20 States that indicated they plan to implement matching systems in the future, 5 plan to implement the State Death Match, 5 plan to implement the New Hires match, and 3 plan to re-implement the match with IRS. Table 19 shows what matches the States plan to implement in the future.

B. DISCUSSION OF EACH MATCHING SYSTEM

FEDERALLY MANDATED MATCHES

1. Prisoner Verification System

The value of food stamp benefits that a household is entitled to receive is determined partially by the number of eligible household members. Prisoners are not counted as household members when benefits are calculated. To identify prisoner participation, computer matches are conducted using the Prisoner Verification System. The Prisoner Verification System is a mandated match with SSA national prison records to obtain identification information to detect households reporting incarcerated individuals as household members for the purpose of food stamp eligibility. This match is mandated as a result of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and was not available in 1991. Forty-eight States reported that they are currently using this match. Seventeen of the States that reported using the match, and the two States not currently using it, reported that they do not find it useful or effective. Four States said it was too soon to tell whether or not the match is effective for them.

The problem with the Prisoner Verification System most commonly reported by States is that the data are not received in a timely fashion and that the information is outdated. Many of the matches turn out to be incorrect because the person has already been released from prison. Lack of a release date on the match reports has led States to spend a great deal of time following up and investigating hits—often to find out that the client is no longer incarcerated.

TABLE 19
FUTURE STATE MATCHING SYSTEMS

State	Number of Planned Matching Systems	Matching Systems Planned
Alaska	5	Tribal Assistance Match, BENDEX, BEERS, IRS
Arkansas	2	Border States Duplicate Participation, DRS
Delaware	3	Criminal justice information system, New Hires, State Drug Felons
Idaho	3	STROP, State Death Match, State Prison Match
Massachusetts	6	Federal Employees Match, Federal Retirees Match, Multiple Benefit Fraud Match, State Drug Felons, State and Federal Veterans Match, Fleeing Felons
Michigan	2	State Death Match, State Prison Match
Montana	1	State Worker's Compensation
Nebraska	2	State Death Match, New Hires
New Hampshire	1	IRS
New Mexico	3	State Drug Felons, IRS, BEERS
New York	2	FBI Match, State Bank Match
Ohio	3	State Mental Health Records, STROP, State Prison Match
Oregon	2	Prisoner Match
Pennsylvania	3	State Worker's Compensation, Fleeing Felons, New Hires
Rhode Island	2	New Hires, Fleeing Felons
South Carolina	1	Quarters of Coverage
Virginia	1	New Hires
Vermont	1	State Death Match
West Virginia	1	Foster Care Adoption Match
Wyoming	4	State Workfare/Training/Education Match, State Death Match, Biometrics, Day Care License Information

SOURCE: 2000 Census of State FSAs.

Several States explained that it can be helpful in the rare circumstance where they did not realize someone was incarcerated. Including more information on the match report would lessen the burden on States for followup and make this a more useful match. See Appendix Volume Three System Table 5 for more information.

2. Social Security Administration (SSA) Death Match

The SSA death match collects information from SSA national death records to identify deceased individuals who are still listed as household members in households receiving food stamps. States were required to use this match after 1998. At the time of the survey, many States had not implemented the match due to delays from Y2K priorities. Forty-five States reported conducting the death match through SSA. At the time of the survey, many States had not yet implemented the match. Seventeen States reported that the death match was useful and effective; 10 States either reported that it was not effective or that it was too soon to tell.⁶ States that did not think the match was effective reported that the data are often inaccurate.

FEDERAL MATCHES

3. State Wage Information Collection Agency (SWICA)

SWICA is a match with State UI wage information reported to the State UI agency each quarter by employers whose employees are covered by UI. SWICA data are three to six months old when matched. SWICA was an IEVS mandated system in 1991, and 52 States reported using it at that time. In this study, 51 States report that they continue to conduct a match with SWICA. Of the 51 States currently using the system, one State reported not finding it useful, due to the sometimes outdated information. All other States indicated that SWICA is valuable

⁶This information is based on data collected during the Census, as well as FNS data from August 2000.

and reliable and a good source of information on unreported income. Although most States find this to be an effective matching system, some complaints were voiced. Several States report that the information is not timely enough. A few States said that SWICA data provide a good starting point but that further research into cases usually is required. One State said that the information is often duplicative of data obtained through the New Hires match.

4. State Data Exchange (SDX)

SDX is a match with the Social Security Income (SSI) benefits database maintained by the SSA to collect SSI benefits data. Use of SDX for computer matching went from 48 States in 1991 to 50 States in 2000. All the States that responded indicated that they found this to be a useful match. Some of the reasons given are:

- Verifying benefits and disability information
- Verifying identification information
- Detecting unreported income
- Cost effectiveness

5. Unemployment Insurance (UI)

This is a match with State UI information on benefits provided to UI recipients each month. In 1991, 51 States reported using the UI system. UI was one of the IEVS mandated systems at that time. In the 2000 study, 49 States reported that they are continuing to use the UI match. Of the 49 States conducting matches with UI, all reported that they find the match to be useful and effective. The most common reason given is that this match provides useful data on unreported income and resources. Several States added that the match is cost effective and that the data are more timely than data from some other matches, although they are not available immediately.

6. Benefits Data Exchange (BENDEX)

BENDEX is a match with SSA databases to collect information on Old Age and Survivor Insurance benefits and other benefits provided under Title III of the Social Security Act. These include SSA benefits maintained in the Master Beneficiary File, and, for quantifying quarters of coverage for SSA eligibility, data maintained in the Master Earnings File.

In 1991, 50 States reported using the BENDEX match; this decreased to 48 in 2000. All States that responded indicated that they found the match to be useful and effective. The reasons given include current information, cost effectiveness, a timesaver for the caseworker, and reliable data.

7. Internal Revenue Service (IRS)

The IRS match collects interest, dividends, and other types of unearned income maintained by the IRS. These data are compiled from IRS Form 1099. IRS was one of the two systems that were most often discontinued between the 1991 survey and this study. In 1991, IRS matching was mandated through IEVS, and 51 States reported using it. In 2000, conducting a match with IRS was no longer mandated, and only 42 States reported that they are still conducting this match. Many of the States still using this matching system report that it is not always useful or effective in detecting fraud and abuse in the FSP. In particular, of the 42 States that are conducting the match with IRS, 17 reported that it is not a useful match, for the same reasons given by the States that discontinued the match. The most common complaint is that the data are already out-of-date by the time they are received (data are often 18 to 24 months old). Another common complaint concerns the onerous security requirements imposed by IRS.

8. Quarters of Coverage

Quarters of Coverage is a match with an SSA database, to verify that aliens have 40 quarters of employment coverage in order to qualify for benefits. Forty-two States are conducting the Quarters of Coverage match. All States but one indicated that this match is useful and effective. States find the data useful because they are necessary to determine eligibility and are timely.

9. Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports (BEERS)

BEERS is a match with Social Security Administration (SSA) data on annual earnings collected on the IRS Form W-2, including: (1) self-employment, (2) out-of-State wages, (3) federal and military wages, and (4) agricultural earnings. Findings for the BEERS match were similar to those for the IRS. In 1991, when BEERS was a required match, 50 States reported using it. In 2000, the number of States using this match had decreased to 40. Other than IRS, this is the most frequently discontinued match. This is particularly noteworthy, since, in general, computer matching has increased in nearly every State. Eleven of the States that are currently using BEERS do not find the system useful or effective, for reasons similar to those mentioned in relation to the IRS match. The data are often found by the States to be too out-of-date to be useful by the time they are received. Several States also mentioned the burdensome security requirements of BEERS.

STATE MATCHES

10. State New Hires

This database contains the identification of newly hired individuals as reported by employers and is more timely than SWICA. Employer New Hires reporting requirements were instituted in the 1990s primarily as a result of child support enforcement laws. Use of the State

New Hires match rose from 2 in 1991 to 43 in 2000.⁷ All States that use the match indicated that they found it to be useful and effective; several indicated that this was the most useful of all their matching systems. The data are particularly timely, often providing new information on clients who have failed to report a new job or earnings. A number of States reported that this match generates a significant cost savings.

11. Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

DMV is a match with the State Department of Motor Vehicles database to verify automobile assets and identification. In 1991, the DMV match was used by 10 States, which was more than any other non-IEVS matching system. Thirty-four States reported using the DMV match in 2000. Twenty of these have online, real-time access to the DMV computer system, rather than matching through a batch process. All but one State indicated that the match is useful and effective for providing identification and resource information.

12. Child Support

This is a match with State or Federal Parent Locator Service child support databases for identification and income information. Use of the Child Support match rose from 5 States in 1991, to 28 in 2000. All the States that responded indicated that this was a useful and effective matching program for their State. Reasons for their positive rating included helpfulness for allowing deductions and identification information, time savings for the eligibility worker, and reliable information. The only negative mentioned was that the report contains too much information.

⁷This information is based on data collected by FNS after the census was completed.

13. State Tax Refund Offset Program (STROP)

The STROP collects information from the State Department of Revenue for offsetting State income tax refunds to collect claims against households for over-issued food stamp benefits where those claims are past due. Use of the STROP match rose from 1 State in 1991, to 22 in 2000. All States that conduct this match indicated that it is useful and effective in collecting overpayments.

14. State Prison Match

The State Prison Match collects information from the State Department of Correction prison records to identify households reporting incarcerated individuals as household members for the purpose of food stamp eligibility. The number of States using the State Prison Match rose from 4 in 1991, to 22 in 2000. As with the Prisoner Verification System, States indicated mixed feelings about the usefulness of this matching system. Four States reported that the data can be inaccurate, as well as time-consuming and expensive to verify. States cited examples where an individual was in prison for one day and released, but then showed up on the report as being incarcerated.

15. State Death Match

The State Death Match collects information from the State vital statistics records, to identify deceased individuals who are still listed as household members in households receiving food stamps. Use of the State Death Match rose from 2 States in 1991, to 21 in 2000.⁸ All States but one indicated that they found this match to be useful and timely. One State reported that this match was more useful than the SSA Death Match. Five of the States, however, either expressed some concerns or said it was too soon to comment. The most common concern expressed was

that sometimes the reports contain erroneous data, and thus it would be useful to incorporate some checks and balances.

16. State Fleeing Felons

Fleeing Felons is a match with the State database of fleeing felons to determine whether household members should be disqualified because of their fleeing-felon status. Fleeing Felons is a new matching system that is currently being used by 19 States. Three other States expressed interest in implementing this system in the future. Response to this match is similar to the response to the prison matches. Although information is available, caseworkers have to review a large amount of outdated information and spend a lot of time verifying it. As with the prison match, a prime concern is individuals showing up on reports who are fleeing felons for only one day. Two States said this report is a lot more useful to law enforcement officials than it is to the FSP.

⁸Data were collected during the Census only. No data were provided by FNS.

CHAPTER IV—CONCLUSION

The State census of FSP computer matching produced two general findings: (1) that States have significantly increased their use of computer matching to enhance program integrity since the last study was conducted in 1991, and (2) that State technical capabilities for conducting matches with external databases have increased greatly since 1991.

1. Findings: How States Use Computer Matching

There were dramatic changes in State use of computer matching systems in the 1990s, both in terms of the number of systems used and the frequency and timeliness of matches.

- The use of computer matching systems by States has almost doubled since 1991. In 1991, the average number of systems used by States was about 7.5; it currently is about 14.
- In 1991 only three States (Florida, Illinois, and California) used more than 10 matching systems. In 2000, 45 States reported using more than 10 matching systems.

The systems most frequently added to States' matching programs are:

- Prisoner Verification System (mandated)—48 States, not available in 1991
- Social Security Administration (SSA) Death Match (mandate)—45 States, not available in 1991
- Disqualified Recipient System (DRS) Federal or State—44 States, not available in 1991
- Quarters of Coverage—42 States, not available in 1991
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) —34 States, 10 in 1991
- State New Hires—43⁹ States now, 2 in 1991
- Child Support—28 States now, 5 in 1991

⁹This information is based on data collected by FNS after the census was completed.

- State Tax Refund Offset Program (STROP)—22 States now, 1 in 1991
- State Fleeing Felons—19 States now, not available in 1991

Most States continue to use the six external matching systems comprising the original IEVS, which was established in 1986. As a result of PRWORA these systems are no longer mandated but they are still used because they are perceived to provide useful data. At least 48 States continue to use the State Wage Information Collection Agency (SWICA), State Data Exchange (SDX), Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX) matches.

Even though there was a large increase in the number of matching systems used, States also discontinued using some matching systems.

- Eighteen States indicated that they have discontinued using a total of 40 matching systems that they reported using in 1991. The States that have chosen to discontinue using systems most often have discontinued Internal Revenue Service (IRS) matches (nine States) and Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports (BEERS) matches (eight States).
- The reasons most often given for discontinuing these systems are the burdensome security requirements imposed by IRS and the fact that the data returned from these matches often are too old to be useful.

Twenty States indicated that they plan to implement a total of 48 matching systems in the future. Five States reported that they intend to implement the State Death match, five States will be implementing the New Hires match, and three States plan to reimplement the match with IRS.

States reported that 87 percent of matching systems used were effective for detecting fraud and abuse in the FSP. Nine percent of systems used were not useful and effective. For three percent of systems used, States reported that they did not know if they were effective. When a State indicated that it did not find a particular matching system useful, the reasons given pertained to outdated or erroneous data retrieved from the match.

2. Findings: Increased Technological Capabilities

Technological advances, particularly the growth in communications networks, have greatly increased State capabilities for matching. States can now send cases to be matched and can receive match results via communications networks, rather than by traditional shipping of magnetic media. These advances have led to much more rapid responses from external databases. States now have a much greater capability to initiate queries to external databases on demand from a caseworker, rather than wait for routine batch matches.

- Thirty-eight percent of matches can now be accessed online; only 12.5 percent of matches could be accessed online in 1991.
- SSA has developed common interfaces to its various databases, such as the State Online Query System (SOLQ) and the State Verification Exchange System (SVES). Forty-three States reported using SVES.¹⁰ A State may now send a single query to SSA and the case will be matched with the social security number (SSN) identity file to verify the SSN, and with the databases which contain information on SSA and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits and covered income. These interfaces thus bundle the separate matches previously conducted, such as Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), State Data Exchange (SDX), Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reports System (BEERS), Numident, Quarters of Coverage, SSA Death Match and Prison Verification System.
- There has been an increase in the level of intra-State automation. State databases such as DMV, SWICA, and UI are now linked directly with Food Stamp client databases. This results in a virtual integration with the Food Stamp client database; when queries are made to the client database regarding eligibility, the query is automatically routed to these other State databases, and the response is almost immediate.

¹⁰This information is based on data collected by FNS in August 2000.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF KEY COMPUTER MATCHING TERMS

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Alabama	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	BENDEX
	BEERS	Prisoner Verification
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
	SDX	IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
	PADX	
Alaska	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	Prisoner Verification
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
	SDX	Quarters of Coverage
	State wages	Child Support
	Longevity Bonus	State Prison Match
	Permanent Fund	State Employees
		Longevity Fund
	Permanent Fund	
Arizona	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
	SDX	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		New Hires
	State Treasury Offset Program	
	State Death Match	

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Arizona		Fleeing Felons
		Fleeing Felons
		State Lottery Winners
		State Assessor's Records
		Finger Imaging
		Maricopa County Jail
Arkansas	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Child Support	DRS
	Worker's Compensation	Quarters of Coverage
		Child Support
	State Prison Match	
California	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Department of Corrections	DRS
	Lottery Winners	IRS
	Disability (EDD)	Quarters of Coverage
	Franchise Tax Board	BEERS
	Homeless	New Hires
	MEDS	State Treasury Offset Program
	Tax Intercept	Fleeing Felons
		State Workers Compensation
		State Lottery Winners
	California Youth Authority	
	Homeless	
	Jail Reporting System	
	State Franchise Tax Board	

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Colorado	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BENDEX	BENDEX
	SDX	Prisoner Verification
	Client Database	SSA Death Match
	LEAP Program	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Treasury Offset Program
		Fleeing Felons
	Day care License	
	State Workfare/Training/Education	
	Public Assistance	
Connecticut	BENDEX	SWICA
	SDX	SDX
		UI
		BENDEX
		Prisoner Verification
		SSA Death Match
		DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		DMV
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Prison Match
		State Treasury Offset Program
	State Death Match	
	Fleeing Felons	
	State Workers Compensation	
	State Bank Match	

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Connecticut		DRS Property Match
		MA Match
		RI Match
Delaware	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Department of Motor Vehicles	DRS
	Child Support	IRS
	AFDC	Quarters of Coverage
	Death Match	BEERS
		DMV
		Child Support
		State Prison Match
	State Treasury Offset Program	
	State Death Match	
	TALON	
District of Columbia	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
	SDX	IRS
	State wages	BEERS
	State wages	DMV
	State Food Stamp recipients	State Prison Match
	State Food Stamp recipients	State Death Match
		Fleeing Felons
		State Employees
		DC Schools
	Veterans Benefits	
Florida	SWICA	SWICA

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Florida	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BEERS	Prisoner Verification
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
	SDX	DRS
	Social Security Number Validation	IRS
	State wages	Quarters of Coverage
	State Wages	BEERS
	Worker's Compensation	New Hires
	Active Federal Employees	State Death Match
	Federal retirement	State Workfare/Training/Education
	Florida retirement	State Retirement
	out-of-state Unemployment	out-of-state Unemployment
Georgia	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Treasury Offset Program
		Fleeing Felons
	Guam	SWICA
Unearned Income (IRS)		BENDEX
BEERS		Prisoner Verification
BENDEX		SSA Death Match
Northern Marianas Recipient Match		DRS
Traffic Information System (TRIM)		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
	DMV	

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Guam		Northern Marianas Nutrition Assistance Program
Hawaii	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Social Security Number Validation	DRS
	Department of Motor Vehicles	IRS
	Bank Match	Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
	Child Support	
	State Treasury Offset Program	
Idaho	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
	SDX	DRS
	Social Security Number Validation	IRS
	Social Security Number Validation	Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		New Hires
	State Prison Match	
	State Treasury Offset Program	
Illinois	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Child Support	DRS
	Child Support	IRS
	Department of Corrections	BEERS

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Illinois	Department of Corrections	DMV
	Lottery Winners	New Hires
	AFDC	Child Support
	Death Match	State Prison Match
	Department of Revenue	State Death Match
	Bendex Death Match	Fleeing Felons
	Bendex Interstate	State Lottery Winners
	Dept. of Rehabilitative Services	Day care License
	Duplicate Assistance	State Workfare/Training/Education
	Financial Management Match	Income tax records
	IVA/IVD AFDC Cases with employed spouses	State Employees
	Marriages	State Drug Felons
	Mississippi Client-to-Client	Department of Rehabilitative Services
	State Employees	Duplicate Assistance
	Surrender Drive Licenses through the Secretary of State	Marriages
Indiana	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		Child Support
		Income tax records
	Illinois match	
Iowa	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Iowa	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Social Security Number Validation	DRS
	Department of Motor Vehicles	IRS
	PADX	BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Treasury Offset Program
		PADX
Kansas	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Social Security Number Validation	IRS
	Child Support	Quarters of Coverage
	Department of Revenue	BEERS
	Employment Services New Hire File	DMV
		Child Support
		State Death Match
		Fleeing Felons
	State Retirement	
Kentucky	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Social Security Number Validation	DRS
	AFDC	IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		New Hires
		Child Support

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Kentucky		State Treasury Offset Program
Louisiana	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	Prisoner Verification
	BENDEX	SSA Death match
	SDX	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		State Prison match
		State Death Match
Maine	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		Child Support
		State Treasury Offset Program
Maryland	SWICA	Prisoner Verification
	UI	DRS
	Unearned Income (IRS)	New Hires
	BEERS	State Prison Match
	BENDEX	State Death Match
	SDX	Fleeing Felons
	Department of Motor Vehicles	State Lottery Winners
	Lottery Winners	Day care License
		State Employees

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Massachusetts	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Department of Motor Vehicles	DRS
	Bank Match	IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		State Prison Match
		State Treasury Offset Program
		State Death Match
		Fleeing Felons
		State Workers Compensation
	State Lottery Winners	
	Income Tax Records	
	State Bank Match	
	Interstate Match	
	Department of Social Services	
	Department of Youth Services	
	Federal Veterans	
	New Hampshire Registry Motor Vehicles Match	
	Parole Violators	
	State Court Warrants	
Michigan	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Social Security Number Validation	SSA Death Match

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Michigan		DRS IRS Quarters of Coverage BEERS DMV New Hires State Treasury Offset Program State Workers Compensation Day care License
Minnesota	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS IRS Quarters of Coverage BEERS New Hires Fleeing Felons
Mississippi	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification DRS Quarters of Coverage DMV State Prison Match State Treasury Offset Program State Workers Compensation
Missouri	SWICA UI	SWICA SDX

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Missouri	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BENDEX	BENDEX
	SDX	Prisoner Verification
	Social Security Number Validation	SSA Death Match
	PADX	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Prison Match
		State Treasury Offset Program
		State Death Match
		State Lottery Winners
		PADX
Montana	SWICA	SWICA
		SDX
		UI
		BENDEX
		Prisoner Verification
		SSA Death Match
		DRS
		IRS
		BEERS
		DMV
		Child Support
		State Prison Match
		State Treasury Offset Program
		State Death Match
	State Assessor's Records	
Nebraska	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Nebraska		IRS Quarters of Coverage DMV Child Support PADX
Nevada	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX Social Security Number Validation	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS IRS BEERS DMV New Hires Child Support State Prison Match State Death Match State Workers Compensation State Workers Compensation State Workfare/Training/Education State Assessor's Records State Employees Federal Bank Match State Payroll
New Hampshire	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS New Hires

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
New Jersey	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
		DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		State Treasury Offset Program
		Fleeing Felons
	Income Tax Records	
New Mexico	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Department of Motor Vehicles	DRS
	Public Employees Retirement Association (PERA)	Quarters of Coverage
		DMV
		New Hires
		Fleeing Felons
		State Workers Compensation
		Texas Dual Participation
New York	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	State wages	DRS

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
New York		Quarters of Coverage DMV New Hires Child Support State Prison Match State Death Match Fleeing Felons State Lottery Winners State Workfare/Training/Education Finger Imaging
North Carolina	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX Department of Corrections Department of Transportation	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS IRS BEERS DMV State Prison Match State Drug Felons
North Dakota	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS IRS Quarters of Coverage BEERS DMV Child Support

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Ohio	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	Prisoner Verification
	Social Security Number Validation	SSA Death Match
		DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Prison Match
		State Death Match
		Fleeing Felons
	State Assessor's Records	
	Department of Rehabilitative Services	
Oklahoma	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	DRS
	State Wages	IRS
	Third Party Query (TPQY)	Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Workers Compensation
		State Workers Compensation
		State Workfare/Training/Education
	Income Tax Records	
	Oklahoma Wage Link	
	STROP	

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Oklahoma		Third Party Query
Oregon	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
	SDX	DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		Child Support
		State Prison Match
		State Treasury Offset Program
		State Death Match
Pennsylvania	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	DRS
	Social Security Number Validation	Quarters of Coverage
	Lottery Winners	BEERS
		State Death Match
Rhode Island	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	New Hires (NH)	IRS
	Temporary Disability Insurance (TDI)	Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Rhode Island		State Prison Match State Death Match State Workers Compensation State Drug Felons EBT - out of state
South Carolina	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX DRIPS (list of Food Stamp recipients found guilty of fraud)	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS IRS BEERS New Hires Child Support State Treasury Offset Program State Death Match Fleeing Felons State Retirement Investigations PC Match Special Benefits
South Dakota	SWICA UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX Department of Motor Vehicles	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS IRS Quarters of Coverage BEERS DMV New Hires

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
South Dakota		Child Support
Tennessee	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Client Database	DRS
	Birth Files	IRS
		Child Support
		Birth Files
Texas	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		State Prison Match
		State Death Match
		Fleeing Felons
		State Lottery Winners
		State Drug Felons
		State Retirement
		Interstate Match
		Nursing Home
		Teachers' Retirement System
Utah	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Utah	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Department of Motor Vehicles	IRS
		BEERS
Vermont	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	DRS
	Department of Motor Vehicles	IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
	BEERS	
	DMV	
	New Hires	
Virgin Islands	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	SSA Death Match
		DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		State Workers Compensation
		State Workers Compensation
		State Lottery Winners
	Day care License	
	State Assessor's Records	
	State Bank Match	
	Public Assistance	
	Paternity Match	

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
Virginia	SWICA	Prisoner Verification
	UI	SSA Death Match
	Unearned Income (IRS)	DRS
	BEERS	Quarters of Coverage
	SDX	DMV
	Department of Motor Vehicles	New Hires
Washington	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
		DRS
		IRS
		Quarters of Coverage
		BEERS
		DMV
		New Hires
		Child Support
		State Prison Match
		State Death Match
	Fleeing Felons	
	State Workers Compensation	
	Day care License	
West Virginia	SWICA	SWICA
	UI	SDX
	Unearned Income (IRS)	UI
	BEERS	BENDEX
	BENDEX	Prisoner Verification
	SDX	SSA Death Match
	Worker's Compensation	DRS
		Quarters of Coverage
	DMV	
	New Hires	

Comparison of Matching Systems Used in 1991 and 2000

State	State Systems 1991	State Systems 2000
West Virginia		Child Support State Treasury Offset Program State Workers Compensation Foster care/Adoption - Financial Info
Wisconsin	SWICA UI UI Unearned Income (IRS) BEERS BENDEX SDX Income Maintenance	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match DRS IRS Quarters of Coverage BEERS New Hires State Prison Match State Treasury Offset Program Fleeing Felons Income Maintenance Match (other states)
Wyoming	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX BEERS Unearned Income (IRS)	SWICA SDX UI BENDEX Prisoner Verification SSA Death Match IRS Quarters of Coverage BEERS DMV Child Support State Treasury Offset Program State Workers Compensation