STANDARDIZED FORMATS

PILOT TEST

REPORT

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

OFFICE OF ANALYSIS AND INSPECTIONS

APRIL 1987

Office of Inspector General

The mission of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) is to promote the efficiency, effectiveness and integrity of programs in the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). It does this by developing methods to detect and prevent fraud, waste and abuse. Created by statute in 1976, the Inspector General keeps both the Secretary and the Congress fully and currently informed about programs or management problems and recommends corrective action. The OIG performs its mission by conducting audits, investigations and inspections with approximately 1,200 staff strategically located around the country.

Office of Analysis and Inspections

This report is produced by the Office of Analysis and Inspections (OAI), one of the three major offices within the OIG. The other two are the Office of Audit and the Office of Investigations. OAI conducts inspections which are typically, short-term studies designed to determine program effectiveness, efficiency and vulnerability to fraud or abuse.

This Report

This report is entitled "Standardized Formats Pilot Test." It is based on a test conducted by seven States and the District of Columbia to determine the feasibility, costs and benefits of using standardized data extraction formats for computer matching of State assistance, compensation or wage data.

STANDARDIZED FORMATS

PILOT TEST

REPORT

APRIL 1987
CONTROL NUMBER:
P-00-86-00083
04

Office of Analysis and Inspections
Office of Inspector General
Department of Health and Human Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) established the Long Term Computer Matching Project, cochaired by the Inspectors General for the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), to facilitate the use of computer matching in Government-assisted programs. The project identified the lack of consistent data elements and record formats as major impediments to efficient and effective matching. To address this problem, project staff developed standardized matching formats for assistance programs, wage/earnings and compensation/benefits.

Under the guidance of the HHS Inspector General, eight jurisdictions tested the formats to determine the usefulness and benefits of standardized formats in computer matching.

Findings

o States established that it is technically feasible and useful to use standardized formats to conduct computer matches.

o States concluded that standardized formats are more efficient when used in both the input and output stages of the match process.

o The standardized formats and related data elements provided workers with a more comprehensive report for review and follow-up.

o State reports identified $1.1 million in savings from the tests. The savings are possible because the standardized formats will enable States to perform more matches. Technical savings will also result from the elimination of the need to reprogram for each match performed.

During the test, The Deficit Reduction Act (DEFRA) of 1984 was enacted requiring State Agencies that administer the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Adult Assistance, Medicaid, Food Stamp and the Unemployment Compensation programs to develop income and eligibility verification provisions. Among the provisions in DEFRA, State agencies are required to "...adhere to standardized formats and procedures...to exchange information to establish and verify eligibility." The standardized formats, as revised and approved by the test jurisdictions, were forwarded to the interagency Payment Integrity Task Force established to coordinate the implementation of the income and eligibility verification provisions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

State

AL	Alabama
CA	California
DC	District of Columbia
DE	Delaware
IL	Illinois
IN	Indiana
IA	Iowa
MD	Maryland
MN	Minnesota
MS	Mississippi
NH	New Hampshire
NJ	New Jersey
NY	New York
NC	North Carolina
OK	Oklahoma
Penn	Pennsylvania
SC	South Carolina
TX	Texas
VA	Virginia
VT	Vermont
WI	Wisconsin

Other

AABD	Aid to Aged, Blind and Disabled
AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
CSE	Child Support Enforcement
DOB	Date of Birth
FS	Food Stamp
GA	General Assistance (State Funds only)
GPA	General Public Assistance (State Funds only)
MR	Match Record
N/A	Information is not Available
PA	Public Assistance
PCIE	President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency
SESA	State Employment Security Agency
SSN	Social Security Number
UCB	Unemployment Compensation Benefits

BACKGROUND

In 1981, President Reagan created the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) to coordinate Government-wide efforts to fight fraud, waste and abuse. One of the first projects established by the PCIE was the Long Term Computer Matching Project which was created to facilitate the use of computer matching in Government-assisted programs. The Project, cochaired by the Inspectors General of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services, identified the lack of consistent data elements and record formats as major impediments to efficient and effective matching.

To address this problem, project staff developed standardized matching formats in four target areas: assistance programs, wage/earnings, compensation/benefits, and medical payments. Standardized formats are predetermined computer record layouts and data elements to be used when State agencies participate in computer matches. The project staff believed that use of the formats would benefit matching efforts and accrue savings through the:

- o   elimination of costs to reprogram data extraction software on a request-by-request basis;

- o   reduction of turnaround time for requested matches; and

- o   improvement of quality and reliability of match results, yielding more effective follow-up.

In June 1983, the HHS Inspector General, at the direction of the PCIE, solicited State proposals for cooperative agreements to test the formats. In response, seven States (California, Illinois, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Wisconsin) and the District of Columbia submitted proposals to test the assistance programs, wage/earnings, and compensation /benefits formats.[1]   (No proposals were received to test the medical payments format; action on it was therefore deferred.)

During the test, Public Law 98-369 ("The Deficit Reduction Act") was enacted, including Income and Eligibility Verification provisions affecting State agencies administering Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, Food Stamp, Unemployment Insurance and Adult Assistance (in the territories) programs. Among the provisions, these State agencies are required to "...adhere to standardized formats and procedures...to exchange information to establish or verify eligibility." The formats as tested, revised and approved by the test jurisdictions were

---

[1] Referred to later in this report as match records (MR) 1, 2 and 3.

forwarded to the interagency Payment Integrity Task Force established to coordinate implementation of these provisions, for their use in providing guidelines to States.

This report presents the final results and evaluations of the eight pilot test jurisdictions.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The standardized formats field test was conducted to determine the following:

   o   The usefulness of the formats in increasing the
        efficiency of inter-jurisdictional and intra-
        jurisdictional matches.

   o   The usefulness of those data elements considered
        critical or extremely important.

   o   The. costs associated with implementing and using the
        formats.

   o   The savings realized in follow-up/verification efforts
        through use of additional data elements and special
        flags.

The test jurisdictions (hereafter referred to as test States) were all public assistance agencies. While the test States had flexibility to perform matches with other agencies either within or outside of their own States, they were required to perform and report on the tests in four stages:

   o   First, States were to create tape files in standardized
        format or develop a computer program to read a tape
        file in standardized format and report information on
        resources used and costs incurred to create files and
        on data elements added or not used.

   o   Second, States were to use the standardized format tape
        file in a computer match and report on the methodology,
        resources and costs for this stage.

   o   Third, States were to perform follow-up and
        verification of matched records (hereafter referred to
        as "hits"). States were allowed to prioritize or
        review a sample of hits to fulfill the test
        requirements. States were to report the methodology
        for prioritization, the total number of hits reviewed,
        costs for follow-up and verification, total amount of

2

overpayments detected, amounts recovered and projected savings.

o   Finally, States were to report their evaluation of the effects of the formats on the computer matching process.

Attachment F contains the OIG Forms I, II, and III which were used in the reports required for the first three stages.

During the tests, four workshops were held with test States to discuss progress, and work out problems with the formats. These workshops included representatives of the Departments of Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and Labor program offices. In addition, several site visits were made to test States to provide technical assistance. Finally, a team of Federal and State representatives, including the test States and Federal program managers, met to reach agreement on a final set of standardized formats.

PART I - SUMMARY OF STATE TEST FINDINGS

MATCHES PERFORMED

The final set of standardized formats represent the experiences and recommendations of the test States. To test the formats, States performed a total of 34 matches including 10 intra-jurisdictional and 24 inter-jurisdictional matches. (Additionally, the District of Columbia performed 11 matches under the cooperative agreement in which the standardized formats were not used. These nonstandardized format matches were performed because agreements could not be reached on approaches to use of the formats.) States were particularly interested in performing inter-jurisdictional matches because the ease with which applicants and recipients travel between States increases the potential for payment errors.

The States tested the formats in the following number of matches: assistance programs format in 16 matches performed, wage/earnings format in 5 matches and compensation/benefits format in 13 matches. Table I displays the types of matches performed and participating States.

TABLE I

MATCHES PERFORMED

Test State	TYPE MATCH			
	Public Assistance	Wage	Unemployment Compensation Benefits	Other
CA				CA .Medi-Cal .Birth Index .Death Index .Child Support
DC	VA DE * Penn SC	VA DE * Penn * SC * MD * NC *	VA DE * Penn * SC * MD * NC *	
IL	CA WI		WI	
NH		NH	NH VT	
NJ	NY	Penn		
OK	TX	TX	TX	
VA		VA	VA	
WI	IA ** AL IL MS IN		MN ** Internet ** IL WI	

* Standardized formats were not used for these 11 matches because agreements could not be reached on their use.

** Two matches each were performed with IA, MN and Internet.

4

MATCH PROCESS

Conversion

Two procedures were used to perform computer matches using standardized formats: (1) both agencies involved in the match created Standardized Formats tapes and matched them; (2) or the agency executing the match developed a program to read a tape file in a standardized format. All test States created input tapes in the assistance programs format. To accomplish this task, New Hampshire, Illinois and Oklahoma modified existing computer programs while Virginia, New Jersey, Wisconsin, California (only Santa Clara county records) and the District of Columbia developed new programs. The participating State public assistance agencies (Pennsylvania, New York, Alabama, Texas, Iowa and Mississippi) also created tapes in the assistance programs format. Vermont, New Hampshire and Minnesota Employment Services Agencies developed matching programs to read input data in the assistance program format and generate output in the compensation/benefit format. Illinois and Texas Public Assistance Agencies and Pennsylvania Employment Security Agency developed data extraction and matching programs to read input data in standardized formats and generate output data in the compensation/benefits and wage/earnings formats.

Data Elements

The States used most data elements prescribed by the assistance programs format (MR 1). For additional information, refer to Appendix A. Fifteen data elements were not used because (1) the data were not available or (2) the data elements were replaced by data that produced better match results. Fifty-one data elements were added by States to: (1) provide more personal characteristics information about individuals included in the match, (2) enable States to use a single tape to perform matches of individuals who simultaneously received benefits from multiple programs, and (3) assist States to screen hits so that only aberrant situations would be referred for follow-up.

States were specifically asked to assess the usefulness of the "SSN Verification" and "Error Prone" flags. The SSN flag was designed to eliminate the need to re-verify SSNs. The error prone flag was designed to assist States to identify problem cases and set priorities for follow-up. Although six States used the "SSN Verification Flag", only Illinois provided comments, stating that the "Flag" was used to refer SSN discrepancies for follow-up. [In workshop discussions test States pointed out that the "SSN Verification Flag" would be more useful if the source used to verify the SSN were indicated.] Four States used the "Error Prone Flag," but only Oklahoma provided comments, stating that this flag was used as a fraud indicator. [In workshop discussions test States requested changing the "Error Prone Flag" to a "Priority

Follow-Up Flag" to be used to set priorities for case reviews.]
For more information, refer to Appendices A, B, and C.

Match Criteria

Match criteria are the data elements used in a match to identify
information from separate data bases which refer to the same
person. All States used the Social Security Number (SSN) as the
key criterion or identifier: five States used SSN and name; and
three States used the SSN, name and date of birth (DOB). Table
II displays criteria used to execute matches.

TABLE II

MATCH CRITERIA USED TO EXECUTE MATCHES

Match Criteria	CA	DC	IL	OK	NJ	NH	VA	WI
.SSN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
.Name	X		X		X	X		X
.DOB	X		X			X		
.Address	X							
.District Attorney Number	X							
.Sex	X							
.Beneficiary ID Number	X							
.Case Number	X							

Screening/Follow-up

Most test States manually sorted match hits to determine if the
match was completed accurately, and if hits identified potential
errors. States prioritized hits based on the validity of the
match hit either to eliminate nonmatched cases from the review
and follow-up process or to alert workers to cases requiring
prompt follow-up. Time spent preparing cases for follow-up
reviews varied between States. For example, New Jersey automated
the process and spent only 2 hours batching 580 printouts to send
to workers. Wisconsin, however, spent 8 staff days manually
screening and prioritizing 476 hits.

Only two States reported time spent on follow-up activities. New
Hampshire workers spent 5.7 staff days resolving 86 hits;
Illinois workers spent 191.5 staff days reviewing 373 hits.
Illinois reported that the absence of data on "monthly payment

amount" and "date of eligibility" from the California records
resulted in an unusual amount of time to make collateral contacts
to verify match information.

STATE REPORTS

States were asked to provide information on the total number of
match hits, referred for follow-up and the outcome of reviews
i.e., payments reduced or increased, cases closed or showing
evidence to support a question of fraud). States were also asked
to (1) identify and analyze costs associated with implementing
the formats, conducting matches and resolving match hits and (2)
identify and discuss actual and projected savings realized from
use of the formats. Most of the States were unable to provide
all requested information, particularly in the area of follow-up
costs and fraud case referrals. For additional information refer
to Appendices D and E.

Costs

Costs were categorized as technical (conversion and matching) and
follow-up and are shown as reported by each test State in Part II
and in Appendix D. California, Virginia and New Jersey did not
itemize project costs and consequently could not identify
conversion costs. The District of Columbia reported cost
estimates based on previous matching experiences. Illinois,
Oklahoma, New Hampshire and Wisconsin reported conversion costs
which included developing and modifying programs and creating
tapes to execute matches. These costs ranged from $1,000 for
Illinois to $3,727 for New Hampshire. Wisconsin, New Jersey,
District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Oklahoma and Wisconsin also
reported conversion costs incurred by the agency providing
information.

Costs per match were reported by all States and ranged from $46
for Wisconsin to $8,550 for New Jersey. Both California and the
District of Columbia provided estimated cost figures. Illinois
and Wisconsin absorbed the costs for the matches they performed
for each other.

All States except New Jersey and the District of Columbia
reported costs to manually review, sort and prioritize hits. New
Jersey has automated this process. The District of Columbia does
not collect this information. Cost varied between States. For
example, New Hampshire spent $34 to review and prioritize 865
hits while Illinois spent $1,270 to review and prioritize 1,053
hits. New Hampshire and Illinois are the only States that
reported follow-up costs, New Hampshire reported $372 and
Illinois reported costs of $16,360. All other States did not
report costs because the data were not collected.

Savings

Test States cited two types of savings (1) technical savings due
to elimination of need to develop new software for each match,
and (2) savings from the actual matches. For technical savings

per match Wisconsin reported $1,500; Illinois, over $2,000; and Oklahoma $5,000. The other States reported that they would realize savings but did not estimate a dollar figure. Savings from matches are monthly erroneous payments identified at the point the error is verified, times 12 months. All States except California reported savings realized from matches. California did not find any cases with errors. All savings except the District of Columbia's reflect the monthly amount of the erroneous payment at the time the discrepancy was verified and do not include a past erroneous payments. The District of Columbia's savings are "estimates based on prior matches." All savings have been annualized. Table III provides information on savings realized from each match performed as of February 1986.

TABLE III
Savings

State	Match Savings[1]	Technical Savings[2]
California	0[3]	N/A
District of Columbia	$140,000[4]	N/A
Illinois	$134,530[5]	$32,400
Oklahoma	$10,000	$30,000
New Hampshire	$22,608	N/A
New Jersey	$148,116	N/A
Virginia	$10,908	N/A
Wisconsin	$615,072	$18,000
Total	$1,082,180	$80,400

[1] The figure shown is the total amount of savings from all matches performed by test States using standardized formats.

[2] Technical savings are realized because States eliminate the need to reprogram for each match. Only three States provided dollar amounts. Savings are based on the initial conversion costs times the frequency of match performed.

[3] California did not have any error cases.

[4] The District of Columbia reported savings for only one match performed using the standardized format.

[5] A 10 percent recidivism rate is factored into the savings reported by Illinois.

8

STATE EVALUATIONS

States reported that use of the standardized formats gave them the capability to perform more matches. All States, except the District of Columbia, reported that the formats eliminated the need to reprogram for each match. They recommended using the 480 character standardized format for both input and output files because the 480 character record is more efficient than the match process used prior to the formats (i.e., producing more reliable hits and better output that will require fewer staff hours to verify). California and New Jersey reported that implementing the formats will increase the frequency of matches. Illinois reported that the formats, particularly the critical elements, will make it easier to determine the validity of the match. Wisconsin, Illinois, and Virginia reported that the formats gave the eligibility worker a more comprehensive report of information to be used to resolve errors identified by matches.

The District of Columbia however, reported that a 480 character standardized format is not necessary to conduct productive computer matches. They believe that a "160 character format should be promoted rather than the 480 character record."

In addition, States believe that use of the standardized formats will eliminate costs to reprogram and will enable States to screen and prioritize cases more quickly. For example, States reported that workers are able to reduce the number of collateral contacts because they receive a more comprehensive report on hits. Most States reported that they plan to use the formats in all future matches.

CONCLUSIONS

The series of test performed demonstrated the technical feasibility and usefulness of the standardized formats for conducting data exchanges. States made the following recommendations for changes which were included in the final formats:

o   Increase the number of data elements included on all formats to provide a more comprehensive report: and

o   Change the assistance programs format to enable States to create one tape to accommodate matches of recipients receiving benefits in multiple programs simultaneously.

9

All States, except the District of Columbia concluded that standardized formats (480 character records) are more efficient when used in both the input and output stages of the match process. This method eliminates the need to reprogram for each match and perform a second match before hits can be referred for follow-up. If standard format is not used for the input record, the requesting agency needs to run a second match of the responding agency's output record against the requesting agency files (as of the date of the original input file) to add information necessary for follow-up and verification purposes.

This streamlining of the referral for follow-up has become critical in light of the Income and Eligibility Verification requirements in P.L. 98-369. Under regulations implementing the statute, States are required to complete follow-up activities in 30 days.

The test States (with the exception of the District of Columbia) agreed that the standardized formats facilitate matches by eliminating confusion on information requirements, reducing reprogramming costs and enabling matches to be completed more efficiently.

PART II - STATE TEST FINDINGS

CALIFORNIA

California (Santa Clara County) participated in four matches of its Public Assistance [Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Food Stamp (FS)] records of children 6 years old with California:

- o Medi-Cal paid claims records,
- o Bureau of Vital Statistics (Birth and Death index records), and,
- o Child Support Payment records.

California developed new data extraction and matching programs to convert and read data in the assistance programs format (MR 1). Ten standardized formats data elements were not used; five data elements were added. For more information, refer to Appendices A, B and C.

Social Security Number (SSN), name, date of birth (DOB), sex, address, case number, beneficiary identification number and district attorney number were used as match criteria. The following tables display (1) technical costs to develop new or modify existing software to convert files and perform matches, (2) match results as of February 1986, of active cases which were referred for follow-up review, and (3) staff costs for follow-up.

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]
AFDC, FS/ Medi-Cal	N/A	$4,795
AFDC, FS/ CSE	N/A	$5,713
AFDC, FS/ Death Index	N/A	$1,932
AFDC, FS/ Birth Index	N/A	$3,615

---

[1] California's conversion costs were included in the total project costs and could not therefore be identified.

[2] Matching costs are estimates reported on OIG Forms II and III.

11

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referral	Follow-up Completed	Error Cases [1]	Annual Savings
AFDC, FS/ Medi-Cal Death Index Birth Index CSE	3,573	70	70	0	0

STAFFING COST FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

[Cost information on prioritization and follow-up is not available].

Evaluation

California reports that the data elements contained in the assistance programs format were more than adequate to perform the various intrastate matches they executed. However, the formats lack specific data to operate the California Integrated Earnings Clearance (IEC) Fraud Detection System (FDS). Filler space was used to include the additional data elements needed.

California concluded that the use of the standardized format in both the input and output process for interstate or inter-agency computer matches has the potential for achieving the following:

- Less confusion on basic information requirements.
- Reduced costs resulting from reduced analysis and coding time.
- A greater likelihood that a State agency will reuse the standardized format (even for a one-time application).
- A greater potential for interfacing a single program with the data bases in different States.
- Accelerated programming activities because the format of incoming (or created) information will already be known.

California stated that their match demonstrated that the "Federal assistance programs format was able to be effectively utilized in the exchange and matching of welfare related data."

---

[1] Error cases include only cases with incorrect payments.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia Department of Human Services participated in 16 matches of its Public Assistance [Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Food Stamp (FS) and general public assistance (GPA)] records with:

o Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and Delaware public assistance records,

o Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, North Carolina, South Carolina and Pennsylvania wage and unemployment compensation benefit records.

The District of Columbia developed data extraction and matching programs to convert and read data in the assistance programs, (MR 1) format. The District of Columbia performed 11 matches under the cooperative agreement in which the standardized formats were not used because agreements could not be reached on approaches to use of the formats. Those data elements not used or added were not identified.

The District of Columbia Employment Security Agency performed the match using Social Security Numbers as the key identifier. The following tables display: (1) technical costs of the requesting and responding agencies, (2) match results, as of February 1986, of active cases referred for follow-up, and (3) staff costs for follow-up.

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching
DC PA/DE PA, Wage, UCB	$150	$2,000 [2]
*DC PA/Penn. PA	$150	N/A
DC PA/Penn. Wage, UCB	$150	N/A
DC PA/SC Wage, UCB	$150	$5,148
*DC PA/SC PA	$150	$2,500
DC PA/MD Wage, UCB	$420	$800
DC PA/NC Wage, UCB	$150	$2,500
* DC PA/VA PA, Wage, UCB	N/A	N/A

[1] Cost figures represent costs to create tape to be used in matches.

[2] DC reported that "dollar amounts are estimates based on previous matching experiences.

*Matches performed utilizing standardized formats.

13

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Cases Completed	Error Cases [1]	Annual Savings
DC PA/DE PA, Wage, UCB	0	0	0	0	0
DC PA Penn PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A *
DC PA/Penn Wage UCB	42	42	N/A	N/A	$5,000 [2]
DC PA/ SC Wage UCB	18	18	N/A	N/A	$18,207
DC PA/SC PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A *
DC PA/MD Wage, UCB	1,000	1,000	N/A	N/A	$250,000
DC PA/NC Wage, UCB	74	N/A [3]	N/A	N/A	$5,000
DC PA/VA PA, Wage, UCB	42	42	N/A	N/A	$140,000 *

STAFF COST FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

[Information on prioritizing and follow-up costs is not routinely reported].

Evaluation

The District of Columbia Department of Human Resources reports that "it should not be mandated that States use the standardized formats if they agree upon any other format, and no attempt

---

[1] Error cases include only cases with incorrect payments.

[2] DC reported that dollar amounts are estimates based on previous matching experience either within the District or with the particular State.

[3] DC reported that data from this match was not usable because it was too badly scrambled to prepare a report.

* Standardized formats were used for these matches.

14

should be made to standardize output (formats or matching procedures). The lack of standardized formats and consistent data elements between States computer files are not significant impediments to computer matching."

The District of Columbia recommends that "a simple standard format of 160 bytes (not the proposed 480 byte record) will facilitate interstate computer matches. The District of Columbia did not provide information regarding specific data elements to be included in this shorter record, but indicated that the supplemental data carried in the standard formats should be obtained by the worker during the follow-up.

The Illinois Department of Public Aid (IDPA) participated in three matches of its Public Assistance files [Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); Medicaid; Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled (AABD) and General Assistance (GA)] records with:

o   California and Wisconsin public assistance records, and

o   Wisconsin unemployment compensation benefits records.

Additionally, Illinois executed a match between Wisconsin Welfare records and Illinois UCB records.

The formats tested were the assistance programs (MR 1) and the compensation/benefits (MR 3). Illinois developed and modified data extraction and matching programs to convert and read data in standardized format. Two data elements prescribed by the standardized formats were not used in the match with California. Nine data elements were omitted from the match with Wisconsin public assistance records, and nine data elements were included in the match with WI UCB. For more information, refer to Appendices A, B and C.

Illinois and Wisconsin public assistance agencies performed the matches using Social Security Number (SSN), name and date of birth as match criteria. The following tables display (1) technical costs; (2) match results as of February 1986 of active cases which were referred for follow-up review; and (3) staff costs for follow-up:

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]
IL PA/CA PA	$3,610	$2,740
IL PA/ WI PA, UCB	$1,000	(Paid by Wisconsin)
IL UCB/WI PA	(Paid by Wisconsin)	$2,990

[1] Conversion costs are costs to modify and develop programs and tapes to be used in matches.

[2] Matching costs are costs for developing software to execute matches and computer charges.

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referral	Follow-up Completed	Error Cases [1]	Annual Savings
IL PA/CA PA	1,053	467	373	47	$134,698
IL PA/WI PA	134	134	25	4	$168
IL PA/ WI UCB	32	10	2	0	0
IL UCB/WI PA	See Wisconsin Report				

STAFFING COSTS FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

MATCH	SCREENING	FOLLOW-UP
IL/CA PA	$1,270	$16,360
IL/WI PA	$1,614	$375
IL PA/WI UCB	$462	N/A

Evaluation

Illinois concluded that the amount of savings to be realized over time was not dependent on the methods used for matching, but rather on the movement from the developmental (developing or modifying software) to the production stage of the match. Illinois estimates per welfare assistance match, an 89.1 percent reduction in the costs of data extraction and reformatting. This translates to savings of slightly over $2,000 per match.

Illinois reports that the standardized formats and related data elements, particularly the critical elements, made it easier to determine the strength of matches and to verify information produced by the match. Continued use of the standardized formats, particularly in final form, will improve the quality and reliability of match results in several ways:

1. Turnaround time should be reduced, thus improving the timeliness of match results.

---

[1] Error cases include only cases with incorrect payments.

2. Follow-up activities will be expedited since standardized output will be easier for review staff to understand.

3. Costs for conducting various matches should be reduced because the production mode will be utilized, rather than the developmental mode.

Illinois plans to "make the fullest possible use of the standardized formats in future data exchanges." The formats will be used for all matches except for intrastate duplicate assistance matches.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The New Hampshire Department of Public Welfare participated in three matches of its public assistance [Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamp (FS) and Medicaid] records with:

o Vermont UCB records.

o New Hampshire wage [1] and UCB records.

New Hampshire tested the assistance program (MR 1), wage/earning (MR 2), and compensation/benefits (MR 3) formats and modified an existing program to create a file in standardized format. All of the data elements prescribed by Format Type 1 were used. Three data elements prescribed by Format Type 3 were not used. For more information, refer to Appendices A, B and C.

New Hampshire and Vermont Employment Security Agencies performed the matches using the Social Security Number (SSN), name and date of birth (DOB) as match criteria. The following tables display: (1) technical costs of the requesting and responding agencies for converting files and performing matches by developing new or modifying software; (2) match results, as of February 1986, of active cases which were referred for follow-up; and (3) staff costs for follow-up:

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion [2]	Matching [3]
NH PA/ NH UCB,	$3,727	$350
NH PA/ VT UCB	$1,193	$620

---

[1] Data from the wage match was not used because the wage data was not in standardized format nor transcribed into a usable form.

[2] Conversion costs are costs to modify and develop programs and tapes to be used in matches.

[3] Matching costs are for developing programs to execute matches, and computer charges.

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Cases Completed	Error Cases [1]	Annual Savings	Fraud [2] Referrals
NH PA/ NH UCB	86	86	86	86	$14,652	24
NH PA/ VT UCB	10	4	4	3	$ 7,956	0

STAFFING COSTS FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

Match	Screening	Follow-up
NH PA/ NH UCB	$34	$372
NH PA/ VT UCB	N/A	N/A

Evaluation

New Hampshire reports that implementing the standardized formats nationwide would save computer time and personnel costs to implement a computer match. Once the standardized formats are implemented, the only cost should be computer costs to execute the match. Standardized formats will "encourage more States and agencies to initiate cross-matches since start-up costs would be minimal, especially since start-up costs are a deterrent to interstate matches."

---

[1] Error cases include only cases with incorrect payments.

[2] Erroneous payments in fraud cases are not included in savings figures.

20

NEW JERSEY

The New Jersey Department of Human Services Division of Public
Welfare participated in two matches of its public assistance [Aid
to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamp (FS) and
Medicaid] records with:

 o New York public assistance records, and

 o Pennsylvania wage records.

New Jersey used the assistance programs (MR 1) and the
wage/earnings (MR 2) formats and developed a new extraction
program to convert data in standardized format. Four of the data
elements prescribed by the standardized formats were not used and
twenty-four new elements were added. For more information, refer
to Appendices A, B and C.

New York Department of Social Services and Pennsylvania State
Employment Service Agency performed the matches using the Social
Security Number (SSN) and name as match criteria. The following
tables display: 1) technical costs of the requesting and
responding agencies, 2) match results, as of February 1986, of
active cases referred for follow-up; and 3) staff costs for
follow-up.

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]
NJ/NY PA	$23,774	$7,312
NJ PA/ Penn Wage (System I) [3]	$ 7,789	$935
NJ PA/ Penn Wage (System II)	$ 6,497	$8,550

[1] Costs figures included NJ's costs of $21,156 to develop
a new computer matching software system and NY's costs
of $2,618 to develop programs to convert and read data
in standardized format. NJ standardized format conversion
cost were not identified. $7,789 and $6,497 are Penn's
costs.

[2] Matching costs are for modifying and developing programs
to execute matches.

[3] Penn. SESA executed two matches, identified as Systems I and
II, with the NJ public assistance file. System I accessed the
wage master file on-line and generated wage data only for
cases that matched. For System II a tape of wage data was
created by the SESA and matched with the NJ PA file.
Two processes were performed for cost comparison.

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Cases Completed	Error Cases [1]	Annual Savings [2]	Fraud Referrals
NJ/NY PA	861	358	358	31	$84,792	41
NJ PA/ Penn Wage [3]	750	222	205	29	$63,324	110

STAFFING COST FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

New Jersey uses the computer to prioritize match hits to eliminate cases from the review process. ("Follow-up is performed only on cases that will be cost effective to pursue.") Information on prioritizing and follow-up cost is not routinely reported.

EVALUATION

New Jersey reports "...it is just plain old common sense to have Standard Matching Formats because of the potential for reducing costs in the long run." Standardized formats will enable agencies to know what to expect (data, layout, etc.). Agencies can, therefore, plan and implement systems to take advantage of the anticipated data.

New Jersey states that implementation of the formats will increase the frequency of matches which will generate data requiring follow-up at a rate faster than current staffing levels will be able to handle. Nevertheless, the formats contain "enough information to allow agencies to eliminate match records from the labor intensive investigations and verification process and to prioritize the output that must be followed-up by a reviewer. New Jersey recommends the "implementation of a 480 character standardized format input record and a 960 character output record for all matches. Using a condensed record will

---

[1] Error cases include only cases with incorrect payments.

[2] Erronous payments identified in fraud cases are not included in the savings figures.

[3] Match results from Systems I and II were identical.

require performing a second match upon receipt of the match output file. This would result in the adoption of two standardized records, not one, and would require additional programming, processing, systems maintenance, etc. The deviation from a single standard will result in the proliferation of other standards and will result in chaos."

OKLAHOMA

The Oklahoma Department of Human Services participated in three matches of its public assistance [Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamp (FS) and Aid to Disabled (AD)] records with Texas:

o   Public assistance records.

o   Wage and UCB records.

The formats tested were the assistance programs (MR 1), wage/earnings (MR 2) and compensation/benefits (MR 3). Oklahoma modified an existing data extraction program to convert data in standardized format. Oklahoma used all but one data element prescribed by the standardized formats and added three. For more information, refer to Appendices A, B and C.

Texas Department of Human Resources (DHR) and Texas Employment Commission (TEC) performed matches using Social Security Number (SSN) as the match criteria. Texas (DHR) converted the Oklahoma files into the TEC format and forwarded the data to TEC for matching. After completion of the Oklahoma match with TEC, Texas DHR converted the match output back into the standardized format and sent it to Oklahoma. The following tables display: (1) technical costs of requesting and responding agencies, (2) match results, as of February 1986, of active cases which were referred for follow-up; and (3) staff costs for follow-up:

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]
OK PA/TX PA, Wage UCB	$2,015	$5,027

[1]   Conversion costs are costs to modify and develop programs and tapes to be used in matches. These are Oklahoma's costs.

[2]   Matching costs included costs for developing software to execute matches, processing and computer charges. These are Texas' costs.

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Cases Completed	Error Cases [1]	Annual Savings
OK PA/ TX PA, Wage, UCB	4,896	463	463	N/A	$10,000

STAFFING COSTS FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

Match	Screening	Follow-up
OK PA/ TX PA, Wage, UCB	$4,628	N/A

EVALUATION

Oklahoma reports that the standardized formats are "essential to an orderly flow of data between State agencies." Standardized formats eliminate the need to reprogram for each match with a different agency as a result Oklahoma will save $5,000 per match. Investigative time for screening matches between States will be reduced.

Oklahoma plans to use the standardized formats to perform matches with other bordering States.

---

[1] Error cases are cases with incorrect payments.

VIRGINIA

The Virginia Department of Social Services participated in one match of its public assistance [Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Food Stamp (FS) applicants)] records with:

  o Virginia wage and unemployment compensation benefits records.

Virginia used the assistance program format (MR 1) and developed data extraction and matching programs to convert and read data in standardized format. Three data elements prescribed by the standardized formats were not used, and six data elements were added. For more information, refer to Appendices A and B.

The Virginia Department of Social Services performed the matches using the Social Security Number as the match criteria. The following tables display: (1) technical costs of the requesting and responding agencies, (2) match results, as of February 19, 1986, of active cases referred for follow-up; and (3) staff costs for follow-up.

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion[1]	Matching[2]
VA PA/Wage,	$28,640	$1,720

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Cases Completed	Error Cases[3]	Annual
VA/PA/ Wage, UCB	90	90	90	5	$10,908

---

[1] Conversion costs of $28,640 are costs to redesign VA's entire computer matching software system. Costs to develop data extraction and matching programs to convert and read data in standardized format were not identified.

[2] Matching costs are for modifying and developing software to execute matches and computer charges. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[3] Error cases include only cases with incorrect payments.

STAFFING COSTS FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

Match	Screening	Follow-up [1]
VA PA/Wage, UCB	$600	N/A

EVALUATION

Virginia reports that the "formats will result in savings if all agencies and States use them for data exchanges, because this will eliminate the need to reprogram for each match performed." Use of the formats will not cause more hits to be identified from a match. However, when a match is completed, if the requesting and responding agency use the data elements contained in the standardized formats, a decision regarding whether to follow-up the match hit can be quickly made. Once the follow-up decision is made, the standardized formats data elements provide the eligibility worker with a more comprehensive report.

Virginia plans to use the formats in all future inter- and intra-state matches.

---

[1] Follow-up costs were not available. Virginia does not routinely collect this information.

WISCONSIN

The Wisconsin Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) participated in 13 matches of its public assistance [Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamp (FS), and Medicaid] records with:

o   Minnesota unemployment compensation benefits (UCB) records (two matches).

o   Iowa Welfare records (two matches).

o   Internet[1] (two matches).

o   Illinois UCB records.

o   Illinois, Alabama and Mississippi Public Assistance records.

o   Wisconsin UCB records.

Additionally, two matches were performed with Indiana (AFDC and FS records,) but, only the Wisconsin files were in standard format.

Format MR 1 and MR 3 were used. Wisconsin developed new and modified existing data extraction and matching programs to convert and read data in standardized format. While two of the data elements prescribed by the standardized formats were not used, ten were added. For more information, refer to Appendices A and B.

Social Security Number (SSN) and name were the criteria used to perform matches. The following tables display: 1) the technical costs of the requesting and responding agencies, 2) match results, as of February 1986, of active cases referred for follow-up review; and 3) staff costs for follow-up.

---

[1] Interstate Telecommunications Network (Internet) - A telecommunications network system which supports a number of interstate unemployment insurance program applications for data exchanges.

TECHNICAL COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]
WI PA/ MN UCB 1	$21	$1,585
WI PA / MN UCB 2	$21	$105
WI PA/ IL UCB	$21	(Cost paid by Illinois)
WI PA/Internet 1	$114 [3]	$704
WI PA/Internet 2	$114	$46
WI PA/WI UCB	$469 [4]	$6,168
WI PA/IA PA 1	$1,907 [5]	$2,091
WI PA/IA PA 2	$35 [6]	$91
WI PA/IL PA	$21	$3,820
WI PA/AL PA	$21	$75
WI PA/MS PA	$21	$75
WI PA/IN FS	$21	$265
WI PA/IN AFDC	$21	$265

[1] Wisconsin's initial costs to develop an extraction program to be used to develop tape files for computer matches were $1,500. Costs shown are for tape development unless otherwise indicated.

[2] Matching cost are for modifying and developing software to execute matches and computer charges. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[3] Costs figures include $21 incurred by the WI PA agency and $93. incurred by WI SESA.

[4] Costs figures include $426 incurred by WI PA agency and $43 incurred by WI SESA.

[5] Costs figures include $21 incurred by WI and $1886 incurred by IA PA agency.

[6] Costs figures include $21 incurred by WI and $14 incurred by IA.

MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Follow-up Completed	Error Cases[1]	Annual Savings
WI PA/ MN UCB 1	71	27	26	11	$9,482
WI PA/ MN UCB 2	56	13	13	3	$2,734
WI PA/ IL UCB	44	44	44	0	0
Inter-net 1	135	72	72	8	$3,828
Inter-net 2	476	271	122	57	$83,000
WI PA/ WI UCB	5465	1275	1275	1020	$295,000
WI PA/IA PA 1	20	14	14	4	$1,872
WI PA/IA PA 2	22	14	14	3	$1,824
WI PA/IL PA	659	659	348	69	$34,980
WI PA/AL PA	2	2	2	2	$16,704
WI PA/MS PA	49	36	34	13	$75,648
WI PA/IN FS	292	178	N/A	17	$90,000
WI PA/IN AFDC	252	84	N/A	10	N/A

[1] Error cases include only cases with incorrect payments.

STAFFING COSTS FOR SCREENING/FOLLOW-UP

Match	Screening	Follow-up
WI PA/MN UCB 1	$400	N/A
WI PA/MN UCB 2	$320	
WI PA/IL UCB	$160	
Internet 1	$329	
Internet 2	$1,068	
WI PA/WI UCB	$25	
WI PA/IA PA 1	$40	
WI PA/IA PA 2	$87	
WI PA/IL PA	$1,445	
WI PA/AL PA	$143	
WI PA/MS PA	$572	
WI FS/IN FS	$885	
WI AFDC/IN AFDC	$1,162	

EVALUATION

Prior to using standardized formats, Wisconsin performed only two to four matches a year. Since utilizing the Standardized Formats, thirteen matches have been performed (11 of these were inter-jurisdictional matches with six different States). Wisconsin reports that the standardized formats are efficient and cost-effective and make inter-jurisdictional matching a simple process. The data elements are presented so as to facilitate assessment of the strength of the match, expediting processing and distribution of match hits for resolution. Also, field staff found the additional information useful for conducting case reviews.

Wisconsin states that Standardized Formats enable an agency to develop an initial software program and to use it for all subsequent matches involving any agency using the Standardized Formats. Wisconsin reports savings, because reprogramming was eliminated for 12 of the 13 matches performed, as $18,000.

Wisconsin concludes that standardization is vitally important if computer matching is to become a nationally viable, practical tool in the detection of welfare fraud, abuse and errors.

MATCH RECORD TYPE 1 (MR 1)
Assistance Programs Format

SECURE Fill Area	Record Type	Fill Area	Agency Case Number	Filler	Century of Birth	Date of Birth	Social Security Number	SSN Flag	Sex	Filler	Applicant/Recipient Last Name

Applicant/Recipient First Name	Initial	Claimant Name Suffix	Address Line #1

Address Line #2	City	State	ZIP Code	ZIP +4	Telephone Number

Filler	File Date	Alien Registration Number	Local Office Number	Match Period Dates	SSA Claim Number	Person Type

Case Last Name	Case First Name	Initial	Reported Earnings	Reported UI Benefits	Other Reported Income	Program Type	Worker Number #1	Case Open Date

Case Open Date	Case Closed Date	Gross Payment Amount	Pay Period	Most Recent Payment Period (Dates) From — To	Most Recent Payment Amount	Program Type	Worker Number #2	Case Open Date	Case Closed Date	Gross Payment Amount	Pay Period

Most Recent Payment Period (Dates) From — To	Most Recent Payment Amount	Program Type	Worker Number #3	Case Open Date	Case Closed Date	Gross Payment Amount	Pay Period	Most Recent Payment Period (Dates) From — To	Most Recent Payment Amount	Requesting County	Requesting State

Responding State	Filler	Match Cond.

MATCH RECORD TYPE 2 (MR 2)
WAGE / EARNINGS FORMAT

Row 1 fields:
SEEKER Fill Area Record Type | SEEKER Fill Area | Employer Identification Number & Plant Identification Number | Active/Inactive Flag Successor Flag | Fill | Century | Date of Birth | Social Security Number | SSN Verif. Flag | Sex | Fill | Ins. Carrier Flag | Employee Last Name

Row 2 fields:
Employee Last Name | Employee First Name | Employee M.I. | Employee Name Suffix | Employee Work Location Name | Employee Work Location Street Address

Row 3 fields:
Employee Work Location Street Address | Employee Work Location City | Employee Work Location State | ZIP Code | ZIP +4 | Employer Telephone Number

Row 4 fields:
Employer Telephone Number | Employer Telephone Number #2 | Priority F/N Flag | "As Of" File Date | Employer Name | Employer Address #1

Row 5 fields:
Employer Address #1 | Employer Address #2 | Employer Address #3

Row 6 fields:
Employer Address #3 | Employer Address #4 | Employer City

Row 7 fields:
Employer City | Employer State | ZIP Code | ZIP +4 | Most Recent Qtr. | Year | Wages From Most Recent Available Quarter | Type Match | Requesting State FIPS Code | Responding State FIPS code | RESERVED For Emp. Sec. Use

Row 8 fields:
RESERVED for Emp. Sec. Use | Health Insurance Carrier Number | Wages For First Quarter Prior to Most Recent Reported | Wages For Second Quarter Prior to Most Recent Reported | Wages For Third Quarter Prior to Most Recent Reported | Wages For Fourth Quarter Prior to Most Recent Reported | Match Criteria

MATCH RECORD TYPE 3 (MR 3)
COMPENSATION/BENEFITS FORMAT

Row 1: SEEKER Fill Area | Record Type | SEEKER Fill Area | Most Current Date of Filing | Benefit Year Begin Date | Dependent Codes | Date Returned to Work | Century | Date of Birth | Social Security Number | SSN Verif. Flag | Sex | Fill | Active/Inact Flag | Claimant Last Name

Row 2: Claimant Last Name | Claimant First Name | Claimant M.I. | App./Recip. Name Suffix | Claimant Address Line #1

Row 3: Claimant Address Line #2 | Claimant City | Claimant State | ZIP Code | ZIP +4 | Claimant Telephone Number

Row 4: Claimant Telephone Number | Fill | "As Of" File Date | Reserved | Local Office Number | Maximum Benefit Amount | Benefit Amount Balance | Current Weekly Benefit Amount | Dependent Allowance | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #1 | Payment Date #1 | Compensable Week Ending Date #1 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #2 | Payment Date #2

Row 5: Payment Date #2 | Compensable Week Ending Date #2 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #3 | Payment Date #3 | Compensable Week Ending Date #3 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #4 | Payment Date #4 | Compensable Week Ending Date #4 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #5 | Payment Date #5 | Compensable Week Ending Date #5 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #6 | Payment Date #6

Row 6: Payment Date #6 | Compensable Week Ending Date #6 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #7 | Payment Date #7 | Compensable Week Ending Date #7 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #8 | Payment Date #8 | Compensable Week Ending Date #8 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #9 | Payment Date #9 | Compensable Week Ending Date #9 | Benefit Offset Code

Row 7: Benefit Payment #10 | Payment Date #10 | Compensable Week Ending Date #10 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #11 | Payment Date #11 | Compensable Week Ending Date #11 | Filler | Type Match | Requesting State FIPS Code | Responding State FIPS code | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #12 | Payment Date #12 | Compensable Week Ending Date #12 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #13

Row 8: Payment Date #13 | Compensable Week Ending Date #13 | Benefit Offset Code | Benefit Payment #14 | Payment Date #14 | Compensable Week Ending Date #14 | Match Period Dates From | To | Filler | Prt I/A Flag | Match Criteria

APPENDIX B

DATA ELEMENTS ADDED

Data Element	State	Reason for Adding Data Element
AFDC Begin Date	Wisconsin	To facilitate processing output.
AFDC End Date	Wisconsin	To facilitate processing output.
Absent Parent Code	Oklahoma	Future use.
Source Agency File	New Jersey Virginia	Identify agency from which file originates.
Cross Reference (2 codes)	New Jersey	Provide applicant/recipient public assistance history.
*Case Type or Program Code	New Jersey Wisconsin	Identify categories of assistance received.
*County Code	Oklahoma	To display all hits in county sequence.
County Office Code	Oklahoma	To display all hits by Office within a specific county.
*Client Number	Virginia New Jersey	Relationship to case name or person who appears as head of assistance unit, called "person code" in New Jersey.
Child Support Case Number	California	Required for special match.
Child Support File, Name, DOB, SSN	California	Required for special match.
Depravation Code	California	Required for special match.

* Data element was added to the standardized format MR 1.

36

DATA ELEMENTS ADDED

Data Element	State	Reason for Adding Data Element
District Attorney Number	California	Required for special match.
Date/Time Record Created	Virginia	Indicate date and time report generated.
*Earned Income	New Jersey	Gross amount of income earned by the applicant/recipient.
*UCB Reported Indicator	Wisconsin New Jersey	Indicator to show that recipient reported receipt of UCB.
Food Stamp Indicator	New Jersey Wisconsin Illinois Virginia	Case investigation, statistical use.
Food Stamp Application Date	New Jersey	Case investigation/review.
Food Stamp Allotment Amount	New Jersey	Case investigation/review.
*Food Stamp Certification Date	New Jersey Wisconsin	Case investigation/review.
Food Stamp End Eligibility Date	Wisconsin	Case review.
*Food Stamp Household Income	New Jersey	Case investigation/review.
Grant Reduction	New Jersey	Case investigation.
*Grant Amount (Net)	New Hampshire	Case review.

DATA ELEMENTS ADDED

Data Element	State	Reason for Adding Data Element
AFDC Application Date	New Jersey	Refers to AFDC program - case investigation.
Marital Status	New Jersey	Case investigation/review.
*Medicaid Person Number	New Jersey Wisconsin	Distinguish Medicaid recipients in case.
*Medicaid Begin/End (2 codes)	Wisconsin	Case review.
Medicaid Name, SSN DOB	California	Required for special match.
Name Control	New Jersey	Secondary match element-privacy purposes.
Person Program Indicator	New Jersey	Develop unduplicated record counts for reports.
Payee Indicator	New Jersey	Case investigation/review.
Person Indicator	New Jersey	Identify type of assistance received.
Redetermination Date	New Jersey	Case investigation/review.
Race	Virginia	Person identification.
*Representative Payee	New Jersey	Identification.
	Virginia	Identification.
*UCB Amount	New Jersey Wisconsin	Screening and investigation.

DATA ELEMENTS NOT USED

Data Element	State	Reason for not Using Data Element
Century	California	Not on Master File of source agency.
	Illinois (IL/WI PA match only)	Not critical (IL/WI PA match only).
	New Jersey	Required special processing - not critical.
*Date of Eligibility	Illinois (IL/CA PA match only)	Not included on California file.
*Error Prone Flag	Oklahoma	Used a fraud indicator.
	California	Not available.
	Illinois	Not available.
	Virginia	Not available.
	Wisconsin	Not available.
End of Eligibility	California	Available, not used.
	Illinois	Only active cases were included in matches.
	New Jersey	Replaced with FS Certification date and AFDC and Medicaid redetermination date.
*Middle Initial	California	Not available on source file.
*Miscellaneous Address Line	Illinois (IL/WI PA match only)	Not critical.
*Monthly Payment Amount	California	Available, not used.
	Illinois (IL/CA PA and WI UCB match only)	Not on file.

* Data element was added to the Formats because States felt that the data element if used would improve the quality of the match results.

Data Element	State	Reason for not Using Data Element
Match Record Sequence Number	Illinois (IL/WI PA match only)	Not critical.
	California	Not used, not critical.
Sequence Number	Illinois (IL/WI PA match only)	Not critical.
	Virginia	Not needed.
*Program Type	New Jersey	Replaced by State data elements "case type," "Person Program Indicator" and "Person Indicator."
*Person Type	Illinois (IL/WI PA & UCB match only)	Not critical.
	New Jersey	Replaced by State data elements "person indicator".
	California	Available, not used.
*Reported Income	California	Available, not used.
	Illinois (IL/WI, CA PA matches only)	Not on file.
Record Type	Illinois (IL/WI PA match only)	Mutual agreement; not needed.
*SSN Flag	Virginia	Could not identify verified SSNs.
	Wisconsin	Could not identify verified SSNs.
Zip + 4	California	Not critical.
Name Suffix	California	Not needed for these matches.
Local office Number	California	Not needed for this match.

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hit	Follow-up Referrals	Follow-up Completed	Error Cases	Annual Savings [1]	Fraud Referrals
CA (Santa Clara Co./CA-Medi-cal Birth Index Death Index CSE	3,573 [2]	70	70	0	0	0
DC PA/ DE PA Wage, UCB	0	0	0	0	0	0
DC/Penn PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DC PA/ Penn Wage, UCB	42	42	N/A	N/A	$5,000 [3] per month	N/A
DC PA/ SC Wage, UCB	18	18	N/A	N/A	$18,207	N/A
DC/SC PA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DC PA/ MD Wage, UCB	1,000	1,000	N/A	N/A	$250,000 [3]	
DC PA/ NC Wage, UCB	74	N/A	N/A	N/A	$5,000 [3]	N/A
DC PA/ VA PA Wage, UCB	42	42	N/A	N/A	$140,000 [3]	N/A

---

[1] Savings from fraud cases are not included in this figure.

[2] These are combined totals from all matches.

[3] Dollar amounts are estimates based on previous matching experiences.

SUMMARY OF MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Follow-up Completed	Error Cases	Annual Savings	Fraud Referrals
IL PA/CA PA	1,053	467	373	47	$134,698	N/A
IL PA/WI PA	431	134	25	4	168	N/A
IL PA/ WI UCB	32	10	2	0	0 [1]	N/A
NH PA/ NH UCB	86	86	86	86	$14,652	24
NH PA/ VT UCB	10	4	4	3	$7,956	0
NJ PA/NY PA	861	358	358	31	$84,792	41
NJ PA/Penn Wage	750	222	205	29	$63,324	110
OK PA/ TX PA, Wage UCB	4,896	463	463	N/A	$10,000	
VA PA/ VA Wage UCB	90	90	90	5	$10,908	0
WI PA/ MN UCB 1	71	27	26	11	$9,482	N/A
WI PA/ MN UCB 2	56	13	13	3	$2,734	N/A
WI PA/ IL UCB	44	44	44	0	0	0
WI PA/ Internet 1	135	72	72	8	$3,828	N/A
WI PA/ Internet 2	476	271	122	57	$83,000	N/A

---

[1] Savings were not reported because cases were closed prior to the detection of the error.

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF MATCH RESULTS

Match	Total Hits	Follow-up Referrals	Follow-up Completed	Error Cases	Annual Savings	Fraud Referrals
WI PA/ WI UCB	5,464	1,275	1,275	1,020	$295,000	N/A
WI IA/ PA 1	20	14	14	4	$1,872	N/A
WI IA/ PA 2	22	14	14	3	$1,824	N/A
WI PA/IL PA	659	659	310	69	$34,980	N/A
WI PA/AL PA	2	2	2	2	$16,704	N/A
WI PA/MS PA	49	36	34	13	$75,648	N/A
WI PA/IN FS	292	178	N/A	17	$90,000	N/A
WI PA/IN AFDC	252	84	N/A	10	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF COSTS

Match	Costs			
	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]	Screening	Follow-up
CA (Santa Clara Co) AFDC, FS/ Medical	N/A	$4,795	N/A	N/A
AFDC, FS/CSE	N/A	$5,713	N/A	N/A
AFDC, FS/Death Index	N/A	$1,932	N/A	N/A
AFDC, FS/Birth Index	N/A	$3,615	N/A	N/A
DC PA/ DE PA, Wage UCB	$150	$2,000 [3]	N/A	N/A
DC PA/ Penn. PA	$150	N/A	N/A	N/A
DC PA/ Penn. Wage, UCB	$150	N/A	N/A	N/A
DC PA/SC Wage, UCB	$150	$5,148	N/A	N/A

---

[1] Conversion costs are for modifying and developing computer programs and/or tapes for matching. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[2] Matching costs are for modifying and developing software to execute matches. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[3] Costs figures are estimates based on previous matching experiences.

SUMMARY OF COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]	Screening	Follow-up
DC PA/ MD Wage, UCB	$420	$800	N/A	N/A
DC/SC PA	$150	$2,500 [3]	N/A	N/A
DC PA/ NC Wage, UCB	$150	$2,500	N/A	N/A
DC PA/ VA PA Wage, UCB	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
IL PA/CA PA	$3,610	$2,740	$1,270	$16,360
IL UCB/ WI PA	Paid by Wisconsin	$2,990	$175	N/A
IL PA/ WI PA, UCB	$1,000	Paid by Wisconsin	$2,076	$375 [4]
NH PA/ NH UCB	$3,727	$350	$34	$372
NH PA/ VT UCB	$1,193	$620	N/A	N/A

[1] Conversion costs are for modifying and developig computer programs and/or tapes for matching. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[2] Matching costs are for modifying and developing software to execute matches. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[3] Cost figures are estimates based on previous matching experiences.

[4] Follow-up costs are for verification of PA match.

SUMMARY OF COSTS

Match	Conversion[1]	Matching[2]	Screening	Follow-up
NJ PA/NY PA	$23,774[3]	$7,312	N/A	N/A
NJ PA/ Penn. Wage (System I)	$7,789[4]	$935	N/A	N/A
NJ PA/ Penn. Wage (System II)	$6,497	$8,550	N/A	N/A
OK PA/ TX PA, Wage, UCB	$2,015	$5,027	$4,628	N/A
VA AFDC applicants/ VA Wage, UCB	$28,640	$1,720	$600	N/A
WI PA/ MN UCB 1	$1,521	$1,585	$40	N/A
WI PA/ MN UCB 2	$21	$105	$87	N/A
WI PA/ IL UCB	$21	(Paid by IL)	$160	N/A

---

[1] Conversion costs are for modifying and developing computer programs and/or tapes for matching. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[2] Matching costs are for modifying and developing softward to execute matches. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[3] Costs figure include $21,156 for New Jersey and $2,618 for New York.

[4] Only Pennsylvania's costs are indicated.

SUMMARY OF COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]	Screening	Follow-up
WI PA/ Internet 1	$114 [3]	$704	$39	N/A
WI PA/ Internet 2	$114	$46	$1,068	N/A
WI PA/ WI UCB	$469 [4]	$6,168	N/A	N/A
WI PA/IA PA 1	$1,907 [5]	$2,091	$40	
WI PA/IA PA 2	$35 [6]	$91	$87	
WI PA/IL PA	$21	$3,820	$160	
WI PA/AL PA	$21	$75	$143	
WI PA/MS PA	$21	$75	$143	
WI FS/IN FS	$21	$265	$865	

[1] Conversion costs are for modifying and developing computer programs and/or tapes for matching. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[2] Matching costs are for modifying and developing software to execute matches. Figures are rounded.

[3] Costs included $21 incurred by WI PA and $93 incurred by WI SESA.

[4] Costs include $426 incurred by WI PA and $43 incurred by WI SESA.

[5] Costs included $21 incurred by WI and $1,886 incurred by IA PA agencies.

[6] Costs figures include $21 incurred by WI and $14 incurred by IA PA agencies.

SUMMARY OF COSTS

Match	Conversion [1]	Matching [2]	Screening	Follow-up
WI PA/IN AFDC	$21	$265	$1,162	

---

[1] Conversion costs are for modifying and developing computer programs and/or tapes for matching. Figures are rounded to the nearest dollar.

[2] Matching costs are for modifying and developing software to execute matches. Figures are rounded.

Office of Inspector General
Department of Health and Human Services
Standardized Formats Project

Implementation of Formats

Instructions: Form OIG I provides for the collection of data and information on the resources and costs to convert data extracts into the standardized formats. This form is to be completed once and submitted to the OIG Project Manager with the monthly report for the month in which all data bases have been converted into the standardized formats.

1. Provide the following data on resources required and costs to convert data extracts into the standardized formats.

Data Extract	Format Used	Total Number of Staff Days	Job Titles	Total Costs
AFDC/Food Stamp	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	
Non-PA Food Stamp	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	
Medicaid	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	
Social Services	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	
Unemployment Insurance	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	
Wage	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	
Other: o _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	
o _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
			_____	

OIG I

o _____   _____   _____   _____   _____

                                                      _____

2. Provide aggregate data on resources and costs to develop software
   to implement the standardized formats.

Total Number of Staff Days	Job Titles	Total Costs
_____	_____	_____
_____		

3. For each format implemented, list the data elements that were <u>not</u>
   used.

Data Extract	Format Used	Data Element(s) Not Used
AFDC/Food Stamp	_____	_____
Non-PA Food Stamp	_____	_____
Medicaid	_____	_____
Social Services	_____	_____
Unemployment Insurance	_____	_____
Wage	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

4. Attach a narrative discussing the reason(s) for not using the data
   elements identified in (3) above.

5. List data elements that were added to the user defined areas in
   each format.

Data Extract	Format Used	Data Element(s) Added
AFDC/Food Stamp	_____	_____

OIG I

50

Office of Inspector General
Department of Health and Human Services
Standardized Formats Project

Match Activities

Instructions: Form OIG II provides for the collection of data and information on the conduct, resources, and costs of match activities. Submit the Form to the OIG Project Manager upon completion of each match.

Identifying information

Type of Match _____

Matching Agencies _____

States involved in Match _____

1. To conduct this match:

                                                    Yes   No

    o existing matching software was modified.   ____   ____

    o new matching software was developed.   ____   ____

2. Attach a narrative description of how the match was conducted and include the following:

    (a) Identify and discuss the logic for using specific edits or screens in the match program to prioritize cases.

    (b) Describe how you used the data elements that are predefined in the standardized formats.

    (c) Include a flow chart of the match.

3. List the data files included in the match by agency.

            Agency   Data File

    _____   _____

    _____   _____

    _____   _____

    _____   _____

                                                    OIG II

52

4. Give the total number of input records read from each file.

Data File	Number of Records Read
AFDC/Food Stamp	_____
Non-PA Food Stamp	_____
Medicaid	_____
Social Services	_____
Unemployment Insurance	_____
Wage	_____
Other: _____	_____
_____	_____

5. Identify pre-edits used to eliminate records from the match. For example, records without SSNs.

6. Give the total number of raw hits from each file with the Social Security Number validation flag set. If this field was not used record N/A.

Data File	Number of Records with SSN Flag Set
AFDC/Food Stamp	_____
Non-PA Food Stamp	_____
Medicaid	_____
Social Services	_____
Unemployment Insurance	_____

OIG II

53

Data File	Number of Records with SSN Flag Set
Wage	_____
Other: _____	_____
_____	_____

7. Give the total number of raw hits from each file with the error prone flag set.

Data File	Number of Records with the Error Prone Flag Set
AFDC/Food Stamp	_____
Non-PA Food Stamp	_____
Medicaid	_____
Social Services	_____
Unemployment Insurance	_____
Wage	_____
Other: _____	_____
_____	_____

8. List any criteria or screens used to prioritize raw hits for follow-up.

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Give the total number of cases referred for validation of raw hits

_____.

OIG II

54

-4-

10. Provide the following data on resources required and cost, by task, to conduct this match.

Task	Total Number of Staff Days	Job Title	Cost
Writing New Matching Software	_____	_____ _____	_____
Modifying Existing Matching Software	_____	_____ _____	_____
Developmental Costs	_____	_____ _____	_____
Computer Processing	_____	_____ _____	_____
Computer Charges (Include CPU Charges Only)	_____	_____ _____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____ _____	_____

Individual completing the form:

Name: _____

State Agency: _____

Date: _____

Send To: Jane Tebbutt
          HHS/OIG
          Room 5644
          330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
          Washington, D.C.   20201

OIG II

Office of Inspector General
Department of Health and Human Services
Standardized Formats Project

Match Results -- Verification, Review and Follow-up

Instructions: Form OIG III provides for the collection of data on the verification and follow-up of raw hits, and resources and costs associated with the activities. Submit a form, on each match, to the OIG Project Manager with the final report.

1. Attach a narrative describing the process used to verify, review and follow-up on raw hits.

2. Provide, by task, the following data on resources required and costs to verify, review and follow-up on raw hits.

Task	Total Number of Staff Days	Job Title	Total Costs
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____		

3. Indicate the number of cases referred for review and verification from each file used in the match.

Data File	Number of cases referred
AFDC/Food Stamp	_____
Non-PA Food Stamp	_____
Medicaid	_____
Social Services	_____
Unemployment Insurance	_____

OIG III

<u>Data File</u>	<u>Number of cases referred</u>
Wage	_____
Other: _____	_____
_____	

4. * As a result of the review and follow-up activities how many cases:

   - were reviewed_____

   - required grant adjustments_____

     -- benefits reduced_____

     -- benefits increased_____

   - were terminated_____

   - had evidence to support a question of fraud and were referred for investigation_____

5. If only a sample of the cases referred for follow-up were reviewed, state rationale and how sample was drawn.

6. * Indicate the number of cases involved and the total dollar amount of:

   - overpayments identified: _____

     -- cases _____

     -- dollars _____

   - fines and penalties assessed: _____

     -- cases _____

     -- dollars _____

OIG III

57

- settlements and judgments rendered: _____

     -- cases _____

     -- dollars _____

- restitutions (money recovered): _____

     -- cases _____

     -- dollars _____

* Figures provided will reflect totals/amounts as of date of report.

7. Indicate projected savings from the match

Match	Projected Savings
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8. Describe the methodology used to arrive at the projected savings.

Individual completing the form provide the information requested below.

Name: _____

State Agency: _____

Date: _____

OIG III

-4-

Send to: Jane Tebbutt
HHS/OIG
Room 5644
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C.   20 201

OIG III

APPENDIX G

State Project Leaders

Francis Brighton
New Hampshire Division of Welfare
Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire   03301
Phone: (603) 271-4262

John Fedynyshyn
New Jersey Department of Human Services
Division of Public Welfare
Systems Analysis and Development Unit
CN 716
Trenton, New Jersey   08625
Phone: (609) 588-2314

Sally Ferguson
Illinois Department of Public Aid
Bureau of Research and Analysis
316 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois   62762
Phone: (217) 782-1128

Larry Harrison
Department of Social Services
Fraud and Audits Branch
744 P Street, MS 19-26
Sacramento, California   95814
Phone: (916) 924-2828

Karl Hauser
Department of Social Services
Bureau of Data Systems
8004 Franklin Farms Road
Richmond, Virginia   23288
Phone: (804) 281-9358

Bill Long
Department of Human Services
Office of Inspector General
Audit and Review Division
P. O. Box 25352
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma   73125
Phone: (405) 424-5880

Kenneth Shimota
Department of Health and Social Services
Bureau of Economic Assistance
P. O. Box 7851
1 West Wilson -- Room 384
Madison, Wisconsin
Phone: (608) 266-0606

Clayton Vickland
Department of Human Services
Randall School -- Room 223
First and I Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024
Phone: (202) 727-5041