

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES**

P.O. Box 419064, Rancho Cordova, CA 95741-9064



June 4, 2001

LCSA LETTER: 01-13

ALL IV-D DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: PRISM ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

Please find attached the minutes from the April 5, 2001 Pre-Statewide Interim Systems Management (PRISM) Advisory Group (PAG) meeting. The PAG is a forum for consortia lead counties and the State (Department of Child Support Services, Department of Justice, and Franchise Tax Board) to exchange information related to program policies and procedures that may impact automation. Although not all counties attend the PAG meeting, all counties receive copies of the PAG meeting minutes.

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

Sincerely,

JOAN OBERT  
Assistant Deputy Director  
Technology Services Division

Reason for this Transmittal

- State Law or Regulation Change
- Federal Law or Regulation Change
- Court Order or Settlement Change
- Clarification requested by One or More Counties
- Initiated by DCSS



PRISM ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)  
May 01, 2001 – Meeting Minutes

---

**Attendees**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
Paula Deen	Alameda/BEST	Joan Obert	DCSS
Jim Mohler	Kern/KIDZ	Jim Beaumont	San Mateo / CHASER
Daryl Zimmerle	Kern/KIDZ	Barbara Catlow	LA/ARS
Robert Silvey	FTB	Joan Thurston	LA/ARS
Sam Fahr	KPMG/IV&V	Gail Thomas	Riverside / STAR/KIDS
Mary Bolch	KPMG/IV&V	Kim Nelson	San Bernardino / STAR/KIDS
Debra Sanchez	FTB	Elaine Moody	DCSS
Pam Pankey	CCSAS/FTB	Chew Joe	KIDZ
Wes Higashi	DCSS		
Ken Maurice	DCSS		
Jadine Takeuchi	DCSS		
Estella Johnson	DCSS		
Bill Brown	DCSS		
Bernard Murphy	SF/CASES		
Dennis Covell	Solano/CASES		
Lisa Cruz	Solano/CASES		

***Income Verification Match System***

Linda Patterson of DCSS discussed the subject of the Income Verification Match System. A workgroup has been established to address the large number of support orders established by default. Various aspects of automation and information gathering for income information will be considered by the workgroup with respect to business process changes. Comments and suggestions were made in regards to automated letters issued to non-custodial parents and governmental sources of information available for the purpose of establishing support orders. Linda will be taking the information received back to the workgroup for follow-up.

***CS 155 & 156***

Linda Patterson advised the CS155 and 156 revisions are currently in the DCSS internal review process. Review should be completed in approximately one week.

***Child Support Integrated Data Base (IDB)***

Bill Brown of DCSS presented information regarding IDB:

- Several of the DCSS units have been reviewing internal processes and working with the State Controller to issue warrants earlier. For the past month warrants have been issued by the State Controller's Office within 2 weeks of DCSS printing the reports.
  - A copy of the IDB training package distributed at the CFSC annual conference, held on February 20, 2001, was sent to CSD report users with the error reports. Included in the package was the IDB overview presentation, IDB Users Reference Guide, and annual statistics.
-

## PRISM ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)

May 01, 2001 – Meeting Minutes

---

- Annual cases were mailed the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of April on Microfiche. The balances shown reflect the last county balance prior to April 5, 2001.
- Issues identified regarding IDB:
  - **Synchronization of the IDB with local county child support agency (LCSA) systems.** Full reconciliation's with each county system within the State resulting in a 'full file/field synchronization' between the county intercept data and IDB.
  - **Need for LCSA staff supplemental training and exposure to IDB.** DCSS is looking into implementing periodic IDB and State Match Applications training to be provided on an ongoing basis. County PRISM Advisory Group representatives welcomed the opportunity for additional IDB training from DCSS and suggested the IDB staff develop a document for distribution to the counties outlining the requirements for county submission of IRS Intercept case deletes.
  - **Easier method for LCSA accessing multi-county intercept cases being processed at the State level.** DCSS is looking at providing access to multi-county case data on CD-ROM to counties. DCSS would provide the data and the graphical user interface tool to view the multi-county cases. DCSS also looking at developing WEB access for counties to view multi-county cases on a secured server.
- Federal offset case deletes sent to IDB were not processed if county cases had balances due resulting from the shifting of balances due between TANF and Non-TANF arrearages. DCSS is working with counties for a complete reconciliation on all fields.
- It has been determined that 'Duplicate Trade-Lines' are being held by CBI/Equifax and Trans Union credit reporting agencies. CBI/Equifax and Trans Union failed to process the L1 segments reported by DCSS for some of the conversion counties. The counties affected were Santa Cruz, Sacramento, Monterey, Merced, Calaveras, Napa, San Benito, Glenn and Tuolumne. Analysis of the problem will continue and a meeting has been setup in May with the credit reporting agencies to discuss/resolve the issue.
- If you have just converted or plan to convert to a consortia system contact Estella Johnson at (916) 464-5324 to coordinate the old case ID's with the new case ID's.

### ***Consortia Agreements & Lead Roles and Responsibilities***

Joan Obert, Assistant Deputy Director, DCSS Technology Services Division, discussed the expectations of lead consortia counties outlined in the PRISM Advisory Group Charter. The PRISM Advisory Group Charter was reviewed by members and feedback given for the revision of the charter. Members requested clarification of county lead responsibilities with regards to imposing ACA requirements on consortia member counties. Counties also requested clarification of PRISM standards. The following expectations were identified as State expectations of consortia lead counties:

- Provide consortia members with needed training to operate child support automation systems
  - Communication of information to consortia members of DCSS policy letters
  - Child support system usage assessments for the purpose of identifying county training needs or inefficiencies
  - Change Control System to evaluate proposed system change requests and track the progress of approved changes
-

## PRISM ADVISORY GROUP (PAG) May 01, 2001 – Meeting Minutes

---

The discussion also outlined concerns the consortia lead counties have with the expectations of consortia member counties. The consortia leads emphasized expectations of some member counties are difficult to achieve. The consortia lead counties identified the following concerns:

- Consortia member expectations of problem resolution too broad
- Unrealistic expectations for consortia leads to resolve consortia members LAN server problems
- Consortia members not aware of State program requirements
- Consortia member unrealistic automation expectations

Consortia lead counties outlined desired additions for consortia member responsibilities to be added to the ‘Governance Responsibilities and Activities’ section of the PRISM Advisory Group Charter:

- Maintain infrastructure
- Use appropriate procedures and policies
- Maintain daily data backup
- Participation in workgroups
- Maintain local interfaces
- Develop and maintain a local help desk
- Become familiar with and follow consortia system procedures

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Update the “Governance Responsibilities and Activities” section of the PRISM Advisory Group Charter
- Develop PAG standards

### ***Monthly Reports Feedback***

Joan Obert advised the monthly reports submitted by the counties are not providing a complete picture of their status. County members expressed confusion with the report template and requested clarification of the report questions. Consortia members advised report questions are ambiguous and create a duplication of information. A determination was made to revise the monthly report format. County members were advised not to submit monthly reports until DCSS completes revisions to the report template. DCSS will accept reports for April 2001 that have already been completed. Report template revisions will be completed by July 01, 2001. The revised monthly report template will be regarded as a work-in-progress to be modified as standards are identified.

**ACTION ITEM:** Revise county monthly report template for distribution to counties

### ***Enhancement Requests & Requirements Analysis Workgroup***

Joan Obert led the discussion to list and prioritize the upcoming Requirements Analysis Workgroup tasks. Feedback was solicited regarding task subject matter and assignment of task priority. County members advised it will not be possible to complete the design, development, funding, and implementation of the CS157 requirements by the July 1, 2001 target.

---

**PRISM ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)**  
**May 01, 2001 – Meeting Minutes**

---

The following Requirements Analysis Workgroup tasks are listing in order of priority:

1. Develop CS157 requirements
2. Develop case closure requirements
3. Develop CS155, 156, 800, 820 requirements
4. Develop standardized performance measures
5. CalWIN Interface requirements
6. IFCR
7. Complaint Resolution
8. PRISON MATCH/ ICR

The following schedule outlines the dates and subject for the Requirements Analysis Workgroup:

- May 8, 2001 – CS157
- May 22, 2001 – IDB
- June 12, 2001 – Case Closure
- June 26, 2001 – OCSE 34A
- July 10, 2001 – CS 155 & 156
- July 24, 2001 – CS 800 & 820
- August 7, 2001 – Standardized Performance Measures
- August 21, 2001 – CalWIN Interface
- September 11, 2001 – IFCR
- September 25, 2001 – Complaint Resolution
- October 9, 2001 - PRISON Match/ICR

**NOTE:** The issue of imaging standards has been deferred until some time after September 2001 due to work load constraints.

Following are highlights of the information presented during the discussion:

Case Closure

The State's case closure requirements are moving towards the federal government requirements. Joan Obert requested counties to run ad hoc reports to identify all cases that would qualify for case closure under federal case closure guidelines. The purpose of the ad hoc report is to identify the impact of pending case closure requirements on performance. Counties that have used multiple systems in the last three years will need to query each system individually. County members requested clarification on cases in which the CP has responded with a request to keep a case open. County members were advised federal case closure guidelines are mandatory and are to be followed unless CP responds with the required information needed to keep the case open. Draft copies of case closure regulations were provided for the development of ad hoc reports. Counties will need to review requirements to estimate time frame for completion.

**ACTION ITEM:** Counties to run ad hoc reports to identify all cases that would qualify for case closure under federal case closure guidelines.

---

PRISM ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)  
May 01, 2001 – Meeting Minutes

---

Complaint Resolution/State hearing

Complaint resolution regulations are currently in the DCSS internal review process. In an effort to provide counties with the ability to comply with the complaint resolution regulations (pending July 01, 2001) DCSS is developing a PC application that will be distributed to counties.

CS Lien Network

Funding is not requested for the budget year however DCSS is looking at the possibility of establishing a service agreement and system changes will be minimal. A new Enhancement request for regulations development has been substituted.

***CalWIN***

Edwina Young, Deputy Director, DCSS Child Support Services Division, advised CalWIN is moving towards implementation. Placer County will be the first of the pilot counties to begin testing the CalWIN system on 09/01/01. Sacramento will follow Placer as the next pilot county. Selection for the pilot counties was made by CalWIN without input from DCSS. The next CalWIN meeting will be on June 13, 2001.

***Independent Contractor Registry***

Elaine Moody of DCSS presented information on the Independent Contractor Registry (ICR). The results of the first match process have been issued to counties. Not all counties submitted through the match process received hits do to anomalies in the first tape. The subject of the ICR was a hot topic at the American Payroll Association (APA) conference. Some States have combined New Employer Registry (NER) with ICR information sent to Federal Case Registry (FCR) without identification to the respective source of information. The resulting situation may cause a duplicate reporting of the information. Duplication of collection efforts raised concern with county members regarding the potential for multiple wage assignment hits on service recipients by counties and the Franchise Tax Board (FTB). FTB is currently using bi-monthly ICR match information which is redundant with county processes. It was explained that ICR information is currently transferred manually, but counties will be able to receive electronic updates of ICR match information weekly. Questions were also raised regarding the appropriate legal actions to be used on service recipients. DCSS is to meet with FTB to discuss enforcement issues related to ICR match information.

**ACTION ITEM:** Meeting with FTB for discussion on enforcement activities with regard to ICR match information.

***Next Meeting***

**June 7, 2001**

**9:30 am– 3:30 pm**

**DCSS**

**Room 1340 (1<sup>st</sup> Floor, West Wing)**

**Rancho Cordova, CA**

---