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

January 4, 2000

LCSA LETTER: 01-01

TO: ALL IV-D DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: PRISM ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

Please find attached the minutes from the December 5, 2000 Pre-Statewide Interim
Systems Management (PRISM) Advisory Group (PAG) meeting. The PAG is a forum for
consortia counties and the State (Department of Child Support Services, Department of
Justice, Franchise Tax Board) to exchange information related to program policies and
procedures that may impact automation. Although not all counties attend the PAG meeting
(as there are designated representatives) all counties will receive copies of the PAG
meeting minutes. We anticipate PAG meetings to be held monthly.

If you have any questions, please contact Evan Auberry, PRISM Branch Manager, at (916)
464-5350.

Sincerely,

CHERYL HOTALING
Deputy Director
Technology Services Division

PRISM ADVISORY GROUP (PAG) MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 5, 2000

Attendees:

Paula Deen, Alameda County
DeeAnn Hebert, FTB
Debbie Campora, FTB
Cheryl Hotaling, DCSS
Evan Auberry, DCSS
Elaine Moody, DCSS
Rick Torres, DCSS
Norma Braden, El Dorado County
George Grenfell, Fresno County
Jim Mohler, KIDZ Consortia
Laura Chavez, Los Angeles County
Christine Anderson, CASES Consortia
John Fleming, San Joaquin County
Ed Del Real, DCSS
Michael Graham, DCSS
Donald McDonald, Sutter County
Lynn Miner, Yuba County
Susan Clark, Modoc County
Vic Johnson, DCSS
Charlotte Morris, Yolo County
Helen Faust, DCSS
Chuck DePoy, DCSS

Rolando Villarama, Butte County
Mary Jones, FTB
Cathy MacRae, DCSS
Edwina Young, DCSS
Linda Sekany, DCSS
Stacey Glass-Smith, DCSS
Leora Gershenzon, DCSS
Laura Roth, El Dorado County
Bill Malloy, Kern County
Dan Scott, Los Angeles County
Gail Thomas, Riverside County
Milt Hyams, San Francisco County
Jim Beaumont, Santa Clara County
Walt Kagel, DCSS
Lisa Cruz, Solano County
Michael Testerman, Yuba County
Sue Wenland, Modoc County
Steve Baer, Shasta County
John Dykeman, FTB
Diane Devito, Los Angeles County
Barry Johnson, Shooting Star
Paul Morris, DCSS

1. Agenda Review, Housekeeping & Introductions

The Agenda was reviewed, housekeeping information was provided and attendees introduced themselves. Normally, PAG is attended by representatives from DCSS, FTB, and Consortia leads. However, the invitation to this PAG meeting was inadvertently extended to all counties. Future PAG meetings will normally include Consortia lead counties, DCSS, and FTB representatives.

2. Rhode Island Interface

California is determining the feasibility of implementing a new intercept system based on a system currently in operation in Rhode Island, which will be called the California Insurance Intercept Project (CIIP). The Rhode Island system, jointly developed by Rhode Island and TMR-Maximus, intercepts personal injury and workers compensation insurance payments from NCPs owing child support arrearages. Any information that counties believe would be useful for the State to use when developing requirements would be helpful.

Besides Rhode Island, other states have implemented the insurance intercept and are part of the Child Support Lien Network (CSLN). They are: Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, South

Dakota, and Vermont. Maryland and Pennsylvania are ready to go live. Pennsylvania will be the first state with a large caseload to go live. Rhode Island indicates that the benefits from implementing the insurance match include increased collections by intercepting insurance payments, and obtaining current locate information including the claimant's occupation, medical/professional license, cellular phone number, pager number, and pager PIN.

There are costs:

- To be part of the CSLN network, users pay a rate based on the caseload entered into CSLN. California would pay the lowest rate, which is $40 per match for caseloads over 200,000. In addition to the cost per match, there is a flat $1,000 per month fee to participate in the network.
- There may also be additional costs for programming of the consortia systems although these are expected to be minor. Other State and local costs must also be determined.

Collections can be obtained either through the levy process (similar to Connecticut's process) or the offset process (similar to our IDB process). DCSS is awaiting a legal opinion regarding any constraints on the type of process to be used. Sample levy and offset processes were discussed, however, the type of process that will actually be used still needs to be determined.

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

3. IFCR Activities

Chuck DePoy and Paul Morris presented an update on activities associated with the Interim Federal Case Registry (IFCR). The State has developed an interface to the Federal Case Registry (FCR) to enable California's access to the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) data. The types of data provided by the FCR include NCP location, income asset and employment information. The feds had advised us that the Federal Parent Locater Service (FPLS) will be phased-out and, therefore, priority for enhancements will be directed to the FCR process and not the FPLS process.

The FCR is proactive, i.e., after the initial submission is made, the system provides continual updates. FPLS does not provide this functionality, i.e., requires continual submissions in order to obtain updated information.

Counties only need to extract and submit case and member data to PRISM. PRISM will determine what information has changed since the last submission, and will only forward the changed information to the FCR.

Once the Family Violence Indicator (FVI) policy has been resolved, and after counties have converted to their consortia system, all counties should start submitting data to the IFCR. However, consortia leads should begin building their extracts now while waiting for the FVI issue to be resolved.

PRISM has been receiving IFCR submissions from San Francisco (entire caseload) and Kern (partial caseload). The remaining consortia should begin programming activities now, and do not need to wait for the FVI policy.

Updates from remaining consortia not currently submitting to IFCR:

- CHASER has completed some general specifications. Once the FVI letter is released, approximately 120 days will be needed to send letters to members and to complete programming.
  (Note: Consortia do not need to wait for the FVI letter to complete programming).
- STAR/KIDS – will begin development this month.
- ARS – Test file is ready and will be FTP'd to PRISM.
- BEST – Beginning to review requirements. Completion date of programming activities will be determined once all the requirements are reviewed.

The Feds have intensified their interest in why California has not submitted more county data to the FCR. Given that interest, counties will be asked to provide a schedule of when they plan to begin submissions to the IFCR in the near future.

Any questions regarding the IFCR should be directed to Paul Morris at (916) 464-5365 or Paul.Morris@dcss.ca.gov.

4. **Foreign Languages**

DCSS needs to gather information which will be used to determine how to comply with the Dymally/Alatorre Act. The Dymally/Alatorre Act requires services to be provided in a foreign language if a certain percentage of the client base population served speaks that language. **To facilitate the gathering of this information, we need to know if each consortia system has a foreign language indicator, and if so, for what languages. For consortia systems with foreign language indicators, the consortia leads need to send a list of foreign languages and whether their consortia county members use the codes. This information should be submitted to Elaine Moody by December 19, 2000.**

- ARS – Has a foreign language indicator but is not a mandatory field.
- BEST – Has a foreign language indicator but is not updated with great frequency and is coded at the participant level.
- CASES – Has a foreign language indicator and has provided a list of foreign languages and corresponding codes.
- CHASER – Has a foreign language indicator.
- KIDZ – No foreign language indicator.
- STAR/KIDS – No foreign language indicator.

Any questions should be directed to Elaine Moody (Elaine.Moody@dcss.ca.gov) at (916) 464-5275.

5. PAG Charter

Evan Auberry distributed the final draft of the PAG Charter. Comments are due back to Evan Auberry by December 19, 2000.

Any questions should be directed to Evan Auberry (Evan.Auberry@dcss.ca.gov) at (916) 464-5350.

6. CCSAS Technical Assessment

DeeAnn Hebert provided an overview of the CCSAS organization and, specifically, the Systems Development and Operations Bureau within CCSAS. The units within this Branch are:

- Systems Management and Planning – Focuses on operations, O/S administration, database design and administration, configuration management, and architecture.
- Case Management Development and Operations – focuses on providing oversight and support to deliver case management components, conversion planning, and knowledge transfer.
- Statewide Distribution Unit (SDU) development and operations – focuses on providing oversight and support to deliver SDU components, and knowledge transfer.

The technical assessment for the CCSAS will be based on the components of the business requirements that relate to system and software quality attributes, management and infrastructure, and will include the following concepts:

- Systems Management;
- Performance;
- Quality Factors;
- Database Management;
- Data Management;
- System Security; and
- Facilities Planning.

A sample facilities survey was distributed. The survey illustrates the type of information counties will be asked to provide once CCSAS begins gathering county facility requirements, however, counties should not complete this sample survey. A final version will be released at a later date.

Any questions should be directed to DeeAnn Hebert (DeeAnn_Hebert@ftb.ca.gov) at (916) 845-5411.

7. Audit Case Listing

Mike Graham provided an update on the progress of compiling the State's Audit Case Listing. To date, 40 counties have submitted their files. We are working with the remaining counties to have them submit their files by Friday, December 8, 2000.

Any questions should be directed to Mike Graham (Mike.Graham@dcss.ca.gov) at (916) 464-5478.

8. CS 155, 156, and 157

Leora Gershenzon and Edwina Young presented an update on the new CS 155, 156 and 157 reports.

A final draft of the CS 157 report was distributed. This report is identical to the version submitted at the November 2, 2000 special PAG meeting with one exception: Line 29 – Cases Paying Towards Arrears in the Federal Fiscal Year. For Current and Never Assistance cases, count every payment. For Former Assistance cases, count only if some of the collection benefits the family.

Someone asked, "What if the case changes status before the end of the reporting period? How is the case reported?" Helen Faust will forward the question to Elise Wing of the Region IX office for clarification.

Post PAG Update: Response is still pending while Elise Wing researches the question.

Any question, comments, or changes to the CS 157 report must be received before COB on Monday, December 11, 2000 and should be directed to Helen Faust (Helen.Faust@dcss.ca.gov) at (916) 464-5042.

Once the CS 157 report has been finalized, Evan Auberry will facilitate requirements definition sessions for all consortia so that the changes for the CS 157 reporting requirements will be programmed the same for all consortia members.

The CS 155 and 156 reports are still in the revision process. Final drafts should be released for review and comment in approximately two months. For the next two quarters however, counties should complete the old version of the CS 157.

Regarding the data Reliability corrective action for 2000, Edwina reported that Los Angeles and San Francisco were able to compare the POP Dec CD against their county caseload and were able to increase the number of cases with paternity established by 12, 265 and 59 respectively. Kern County reported an increase of over 2,000 cases with paternity established.

Counties were reminded that they must:

- Enter the state of birth;
- Must save the audit trail; and
- Delete 18 year olds from the inventory.

9. IV-A/IV-D Interface

Edwina Young discussed the IV-A/IV-D Interface survey that was released to all counties on November 3, 2000 (LCSA Letter #00-07). Of the 30 counties that responded, it appears that

county IV-D agencies are sending the data required to allow the local welfare agency to determine exemptions from the 60-month "lifetime" time limit for aid when the amount of aid paid to the recipient for the month is fully reimbursed by child support.

10. SFY 2001/2002 Enhancements

Cheryl Hotaling discussed enhancements for SFY 2001/2002. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) has made it clear that there will most likely be no federal participation for enhancements even if there is a demonstrated cost-benefit. ACF is focusing on the statewide system, and are therefore not likely to approve additional enhancements for interim systems.

They may consider participating in some mandated changes, but probably not for any "nice to haves" even if it improves worker productivity. DCSS is evaluating the ACF response and determining how to best deal with enhancement funding requests that will not be shared by the feds.

11. Consortia Oversight

Shooting Star Solutions presented an overview of the assessment activities they will perform next calendar year for the consortia systems. They will review processes and procedures the consortia use to incorporate enhancements and maintain systems; identify potential risk areas that could impact the delivery of Child Support Services; provide mitigation recommendations for minimizing risks; and inform the State where critical support or assistance to the consortia is required.

Consortia assessments will focus on processes, and will be based on the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers Computer Society (IEEE) and the Project Management Institute Body of Knowledge (PMBOK). The following management processes will be reviewed: Integration, scope, Time, Cost, Human Resource, Communications, Quality, Risk, and Procurement. Non-management processes to be reviewed will be: Development, Documentation, Operation, Maintenance Validation, Joint Review, and Training. Components within each process area will be evaluated for criticality (high, medium or low), and for completeness (not done, partial or complete).

On site reviews will be conducted over a four-day period. A pre-assessment package will be sent to each consortium at least two weeks prior to the scheduled assessment. The following is the planned schedule:

- BEST(Alameda County)   January 16 – 19
- CHASER (San Mateo County)   March 19 – 22
- Consortium #3   April 9 – 12
- Consortium #4   April 30 – May 3
- Consortium #5   June 4 – 7
- Consortium #6   July 9 – 12

Post PAG Update: Schedules for the remaining four consortia have been finalized and are as follows: #3 – ARS (Los Angeles); #4 – STAR/KIDS (Riverside); #5 – CASES (San Francisco); #6 – KIDZ (KIDZ JPA).

The assessment team will assess and compile the information for the on-site assessments. A preliminary Assessment Report will be prepared. Each consortium will receive a preliminary report for review to correct any inaccuracies and to clarify any misinterpretations of data.

As part of the PRISM Project's oversight responsibility, consortia leads will be required to submit monthly status reports on covering consortia activities. A draft Consortium Monthly Status Report format was distributed for consortia review. Any questions or comments concerning the monthly report should be directed to Evan Auberry (Evan.Auberry@dcss.ca.gov) at (916) 464-5350 by December 19, 2000. Once the format is finalized, the first monthly report will be due February 10, 2001 for the January 1 though 31 reporting period.

12. Wrap-up

There may have been some confusion with the distribution of the October 5, 2000, PAG minutes. Kern, San Francisco, Sutter, Solano, Sonoma, and Butte Counties did not receive copies. Duplicate copies will be distributed to all counties with the minutes from this PAG meeting.

The next PAG meeting will be held on Thursday January 4, 2001, from 9:30 – 3:30. The location will be at DCSS, Rancho Cordova, California. Attendees will be limited to PAG members. Only consortia lead counties should attend.

13. Action Item Review

ACTION	PERFORMED BY	PROVIDED TO	BY WHEN
Questions/comments regarding the Rhode Island Interface	Consortia Leads	Elaine Moody or Stacey Glass-Smith	Continual
IFCR	Consortia Leads	Paul Morris	Continual
List of foreign languages and whether member counties use the codes	Consortia Leads	Elaine Moody	December 19, 2000 Post PAG update: Lists received from ARS, BEST, and CASES
Comments on PAG Charter final draft	PAG members	Evan Auberry	December 19, 2000
Question to Elise Wing regarding case change status before the end of the reporting period	Helen Faust	Response from Elise provided to Helen	TBD

ACTION	PERFORMED BY	PROVIDED TO	BY WHEN
Final comments on the CS 157 report	Consortia leads	Helen Faust	December 11, 2000
Comments on the Draft Consortium Monthly Status Report	Consortia Leads	Evan Auberry	December 19, 2000