

EAMS ACCESS PROJECT
External Access Requirements Definition
Agenda & Meeting Minutes

Project:	EAMS ACCESS SFTP SOLUTION
Meeting:	EAMS Access SFTP Solution Technical Requirements am Meeting

Date-Time-Location:	February 18, 2010 1:00PM – 4:00PM Room 12, 2 nd Floor
Invitees:	Andrea Coletto, Brenda Ramirez, Brian Schwabauer, Camilla Wong, Carolyn McPherson, Dale Clough, Dan Jakle, Danny Teklehaimano, Denise Spelzini, Denise Yip, Dr. George Rothbart, Eric Knight, Gary Gallanes, Gina Garritson, Jake Greenwell, Joel Hecht, Jose Gonzales, Joshua Bright, Julia Burns, Justin Geiger, Katherine Borlaza, Kim Lincoln-Hawkins, Linda Atcherley, Lorie Kirshen, Marc Glaser, Margo Hattin, Martin Dean, Matt Herreras, Oleg Katz, Paul Defrances, Pete Harlow, Renee Sherman, Richard Brophy, Ron Weingarten, Ryan Hitchings, Sandy Trigg, Sean Blackburn, Steve Cattolica, Tara Lewis, Yvonne E. Lang, CKV Sa, Talat Khorashadi, Robert Gilbert; Dave Cohen;
Optional Attendee:	
Facilitator / coordinator:	Robert Gilbert
Next scheduled meeting:	Feb. 26, 2010

Meeting Objectives:	
----------------------------	--

	Agenda	Time	Duration	Owner
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

1.	<p>Participants approved previous meeting's minutes, with Susan's comments that any revisions or additions would be sent via email.</p> <p>Susan again reminded of ground rules, in particular time keeping.</p> <p>Susan presented the upcoming session calendar with milestones. Of note, Monday's session has been cancelled. Sessions were spaced to allow more time for participants to prepare for each session.</p> <p>Susan will be adding documents to the DWC website forum, where draft documents are expected, to avoid public misconception that any of our documents are finished or finalized versions.</p> <p>Today's session will be heavily technical in nature. Business attendees may not want or need to attend. Business Rules will be discussed again in the March sessions. Business Rules document will be revised into spreadsheet format and sent to participants next week for comments and sign-off.</p>	
2.	<p>Questions/Comments reviewed.</p> <p><i>No questions or comments were submitted in time for inclusion in today's session.</i></p> <p>All the late comments will be addressed in next Wed's session.</p> <p>The following parking lot items are still pending:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will date selection be handled for FTP DORs? <i>Judge Ellison responded that the first avail date is assigned, unless there are no available dates. If there are no avail dates, that is a FATAL ERROR and the filer must re-file the DOR until dates are added. Current e-filing procedure requires the filer to attempt filing the DOR for at least 7 days, after which the EAMS Help Desk may be emailed with a request for add'l dates. There was discussion regarding the concern that DORs, whether submitted by OCR, e-forms, or SFTP should all have equal access to avail dates. Participants perceived advantages for OCR filers, where a clerk might add dates, then assign dates to pending OCR DORs already rec'd at the district office. Judge Ellison advised this rarely happens. Electronically filed DORs are more likely to have the advantage of obtaining dates. Furthermore, DOR-Expedited are handled differently than regular DORs, and any DOR filed by an Injured Worker (In Pro Per) is handled with highest priority per regulations. Participants wanted to see consistency in assigning dates. Participants requested that DORs be queued in order of date/time submitted, pending available dates, but this functionality is not currently available in EAMS and would likely be another change request. The "pending DOR" issue was added to the Long Term Parking Lot. Brian from State Fund asked whether service of a submitted DOR should be delayed until a date is rec'd?</i> 	

<p>2.</p>	<p>Questions/Comments reviewed, cont'd</p> <p>Pending parking lot items:</p> <p>3.2.2 EAMS Batch Form Process UC 23 Remove term “submitted” and use a more specific word. Definitions of “lodged date,” “submitted date,” and “business date” are needed.</p> <p>UC 34 Martin requested that Levels 1 and 2 acknowledgements be consolidated into a single response and that all acknowledgements be sent separately for each form filed. <i>DWC advised that the filer controlled how responses were sent; that is, if a filer sends several transactions in a packet, the response would summarize errors for all transactions in that packet, but if a filer sends only one transaction per packet, then the response would summarize errors for only one transaction. During the session, participants voted not to consolidate any levels of acknowledgement.</i></p> <p>Martin requested to be able to send multiple transactions in a packet, but receive responses already parsed out per form. Other participants agreed that this could be useful. <i>DWC put this in the parking lot.</i></p> <p>3.2.3 SFTP Transmission Martin inquired about status of user logins and passwords. Eric Knight added that EDEX currently has a 28-day password that causes recurring issues.</p>	<p>PARKING LOT ITEMS</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Business Requirements reviewed</p> <p>Business requirements will be transferred to spreadsheet format and sent to participants next week for review, comment, and sign-off.</p> <p>Many of the parking lot items will be covered in the revised document. Judge Ellison added Archived Cases to the parking lot.</p> <p>Appendix E contains form field validations for the 6 forms that are approved for SFTP filing. Questions and comments should be submitted by 10 a.m. Monday (would have been Friday, but it's a furlough day).</p> <p>The Cover Sheet fields will be cleaned up as requested last session. This should be finished by next week.</p>	<p>PARKING LOT</p> <p>ACTION ITEM</p> <p>PARKING LOT ACTION ITEM</p>

<p>4. EAMS PTS Technical Requirement document, Use Cases</p>	<p>Katherine Borlaza presented many questions re: Use Cases on behalf of State Fund.</p> <p>2.3.1 Overview of SFTP Bulk Filing Diagram What is a holding tank? Also, from the diagram, it appears that data flows straight into the Curam DB. Please clarify. CKV explained that holding tank is a staging area. The diagram is inaccurate because no data will flow straight into Curam without first being processed from the holding tank. Curam data is involved in the validations, thus the linkage.</p> <p>CKV reiterated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 1 = initial receipt of packet • Level 2 = will be specific to transaction ID; do not use EAMS batch ID because this is not accurate. • Lodge date = filing date = next EAMS business date • "Original Filing Date" will be retained for 15 days, beginning the date the filing is rejected, not the lodged date, not the submission date. <p>3.1 Present Term Requirements – Must have requirements</p> <p>4) <i>Provide a complete summary of all errors contained within the transaction after it has been processed by the EAMS batch interface.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CKV confirmed that all errors for a transaction would be reported in a single transmission. <p>14) <i>Implement the functionality to replace the cover sheet and separator sheet with a data header.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be covered in the tech portion of today's session. Also, the cover sheet fields are under review. <p>22) <i>Provide the ability to file documents under seal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is "under seal"? • Under seal – an external user must submit a petition via unstructured form, to seal certain items such as documents or body parts. The judge would review. • This item is outside the scope of PTS. • Joel Hecht offered that the genesis of this item is related to 3rd party filers, and whether a TPF is able to view the contents of sealed documents, etc. • Judge Ellison reminded that since these petitions are unstructured filings and not approved for SFTP filing, this item remains clearly outside the scope of PTS. <p>At this point, Susan reminded everyone that the UC in this table are sourced from the original requirements gathered last year (see Appendix B).</p>	<p>PARKING LOT ?</p>
---	--	----------------------

	<p>EAMS PTS Technical Requirement document, Use Cases, cont'd</p> <p>3.1 Present Term Requirements – Must have requirements, cont'd</p> <p>38) <i>Define the rules for 3rd party filers concerning the retention of data and documents filed with 3rd party filers.</i></p> <p>39) <i>Provide open solution that is operating system agnostic.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 38 and 39 are outside the scope of PTS. <p>3.1.1 EAMS Business Use Cases List</p> <p>20) <i>Would like to see confirmation both that the document was received and that it was successfully accepted into the system. (would prefer real time)</i></p> <p>42) <i>Acknowledgements sent when information is submitted and again when it is accepted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aren't these the same and shouldn't they be merged? • Susan reminded these are artifacts. These UC will not be edited, but only added or deleted as applicable to the PTS. <p>59) <i>For each submitted transaction package, receive an initial acknowledgement of receipt either asynchronous or synchronous.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgements will be asynchronous (not real-time). <p>3.2 EAMS SFTP Bulk Filing Technical Use Cases Each UC now starts w/verb and the fact that EAMS is the actor, is known.</p> <p><i>Any tables before Table 3.2.1 are artifacts.</i></p> <p><i>Submitter Use Cases moved to next Wed's agenda.</i></p> <p>3.2.1 Acknowledgement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 1 = receipt of submission (similar to receiving a batch ID when filing via e-Forms) • Level 2 = validation results. Summary report indicating whether a form passed validation and moved to the holding tank for processing into EAMS during the next regular batch process, or whether a form failed validation and thus, along with its attachments, was deleted. <p>Level 3 = successful submission. Summary report of forms and attachments from a single packet that filed successfully into EAMS, via batch process.</p> <p>3.2.3 SFTP Transmission Martin inquired about status of user logins and passwords. Eric Knight added that EDEX currently has a 28-day password that causes recurring issues.</p> <p>3.2.4 Layout Martin inquired that won't FTP filings look the same as e-filed filings and shouldn't the layout be reversed engineered? <i>CKV indicated DWC agreed to send out the form field validations spreadsheet to assist participants.</i></p>	<p>AGENDA ITEM</p>
--	--	--------------------

	<p>EAMS PTS Technical Requirement document, Use Cases, cont'd</p> <p>UC 17 There was confusion over the need for EAMS to distinguish transactions within a packet.</p> <p>UC 38 Jake commented that transaction header shouldn't mimic cover sheet data because so many data elements are redundant and will create a really long header.</p> <p>3.2.5 Other Technical Activities (ie: tasks and deliverables mentioned at previous session)</p> <p>Brian from State Fund suggested that outage notification might require some additional UC statements.</p> <p>Martin recommended following "policy document" format.</p> <p>3.3 EAMS Technical Use Cases Mapping Participants shall review and submit comments per ground rules. Be prepared to discuss next session.</p> <p>3.4 Submitter SFTP Bulk Filing Technical Use Cases Brian from State Fund and Martin volunteered to draft the initial list of submitter use cases.</p>	<p>ACTION ITEM</p> <p>ACTION ITEM</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Agenda Items for Next Session CKV proposed layout structures for discussion. <i>Form field validations spreadsheet requested again.</i></p>	