

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

Date-Time-Location:	April 20, 2010 1:00PM – 4:00PM Room 11, 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 Gariitson, 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; Dan Jakle; Jose Gonzales; Denise Yip; Illicena Elliott; Susan Ambriz; Eric Knight; Jake Greenwell; Danny Teklehaimano; Beatrice Yao; Ryan Hitchings; Denise Spelzini; Felicia Black; Amit Khosla; Paul Defrances; Lorie Kirshen; Ritzesh Sawhney; Peter Melton; Sam Morris; Sivakumar Ponnuswamy, Bob Bradshaw, Mokhtar Moussaoui
Optional Attendee:	
Facilitator / coordinator:	Ira Phillips
Meeting Minutes taken by:	Janet Tsao
Next scheduled meeting:	To be determined

04/20/10 Meeting Objectives:	Discuss go-forward plan and finalize SFTP business rules.
-------------------------------------	---

Agenda 04/20/10		Time	Duration	Owner
1.	Open meeting: Review previous meeting minutes	1:10		Ira Phillips
2.	Review submitted Questions/Comments			Susan Gard
3.	Business rules for SFTP filing			Susan Gard / Joel Harter
4.	Break		10	
5.	Go-forward plan including: Lien conference change request Trading partner agreement Web access			Susan Gard / Joel Harter
6.	Next steps			Susan Gard

<p>1.</p>	<p>Open meeting: Review previous meeting minutes</p> <p>Participants agreed to accept minutes of March 18 session and dispense with reading of the minutes.</p> <p>Opening remarks: After a hard stop in March, DWC has made the decision to go forward. The two main issues from last meeting were digital signature and the numbers of accounts DWC can create and support on SFTP bulk filing server.</p> <p>Judge Harter worked diligently with the WCAB to gain approval for digital signature and rescind s signature verification for SFTP bulk filing. Thanks Judge Harter for all your efforts in this enormous accomplishment.</p> <p>DWC has also made stride in increasing the number of account folders we can support from 100 to 600.</p>	<p>Ira Phillips</p> <p>Susan Gard</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Review submitted Questions/Comments Reference: SFTP questions and comments dated 4-19-10</p> <p><u>BR-03</u> Trading Partner Agreement (TPA) is the document external users will submit to DWC for SFTP account establishment. The TPA details the functions/purpose of primary and alternate contacts. This is a business requirement for SFTP solution.</p> <p>State Fund had questions about the purpose of the primary and alternate contact, and whether one is for business and one is for technical. DWC clarified that it wants one contact (the primary administrator) and one backup for that person (the alternate) per submitting location. In the case of State Fund, it would need only one primary contact and one alternate even if it has 20 offices submitting, so long as they <u>all submit through one location</u>. This means the submitter must determine how it will arrange its business on its end: In the same situation, if State would have each of its 20 locations submitting separately by SFTP, they would all need their own trading partner agreements and primary and alternate contacts. The trading partner agreement is basically the contract between DWC and the SFTP submitting location. The primary and alternate contacts do not have separate functions (ie, business and technical)—one is a backup to the other. The submitter will need to establish business rules on its side for how to parse out questions/issues encountered by the primary or alternate contact to the correct person in their organization.</p>	<p>Susan Gard</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Business rules for SFTP filing Reference: Proposed present term solution business rules for SFTP filing V1.6 dated April 15, 2010</p> <p>WCAB is very interested in making digital signature work. Neil Sullivan, Deputy Commissioner WCAB, was present to answer all questions. Mr. Sullivan made the point that participation in the Present Term Solution is voluntary and business rules are not regulatory. For the single signature</p>	<p>Susan Gard / Joel Harter</p>

	<p>forms, which previously required an “s signature” and an “s signature verification,” a digital signature is an acceptable option, but not required. Filers may also use an image of a signature on these specific forms or use an “s signature” <u>without</u> an “s signature verification.” The s signature verification is no longer needed because the s signature is now presumed to be the signature of the person filing the form. This presumption is rebuttable.</p> <p><u>BR-14</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judge Harter worked with WCAB to gain acceptance of digital signature or s signature and to not require s signature verification for single signature forms. • Digital or s signatures may be used on Application, DOR, DOR Expedited and Liens, as well as any proof of service filed with one of the six SFTP forms, lien verification (10770.5 and 10770.6) and 4906g. The C&R and STIP require multiple signatures and still require wet signature. However, proofs of service filed with the C&R or Stips may be signed using the digital or s signature. • Digital signature may be used on the single signature forms that accompany the Application, i.e. 4906(g). • S signature verification is no longer required. • DWC will change rule from “conclusive presumption” to “rebuttable” presumption. Rebuttable presumption means that evidence may be presented to prove the signature was not that of the filer • Image of signature is acceptable as a “digital” signature. • Will this business rule be applied to e-form trial participants? Yes and will be extended to the e-form trial participants as quickly as possible. <p>DWC will add definition of digital signature to the terminology list.</p> <p><u>BR-16</u> Digital signatures (BR-14) will apply to lien claim verifications - 8 Cal Code Reg §§ 10770.5, 10770.6.</p> <p><u>BR-22a</u> Third party filers provide updated list of their clients (the people for whom third party filers are filing). This is further explained and defined in the Trading Partner Agreement.</p> <p>DWC will add and define third party filer to the terminology list.</p> <p>Final SFTP business rules will be published by Thursday, April 22.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Go-forward plan</p> <p>DWC and DIR OIS analysis confirmed that we can address 65% of scanned documents at district office by accepting the six forms in SFTP bulk filing. Our focus will be on the larger filers of paper forms. SFTP is intended as a bulk filing approach—not the EAMS access project. SFTP is appropriate for bulk filers and e-form filing is more suitable for smaller filers.</p>	<p>Joel Harter Susan Gard</p>

	<p><u>Action Item</u> DWC to send out what percentage of the 65% each of the forms constitutes. For example, applications make up 15% of the 65%, (this is not a factual example).</p> <p>Present term solution will increase the number of accounts supportable in SFTP bulk filing from 100 to 600 within six months from implementation. DWC is working on the strategy on how to roll out the accounts. Development of account creation and management strategy may take up to two months.</p> <p>What are the limiting factors of having 100 folders? Personnel, we will have to manually create account folders because we don't have process automated yet.</p> <p>Known scope of Present Term Solution is the following six forms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application for adjudication of claim • DOR • DOR expedited • Lien • C&R • Stip <p><u>Lien conference change request</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lien conference is needed to ensure DOR pending queue is viable. This will create separate hearing slots for liens and allows more flexibility with scheduling. • Hearing slot windows may be extended in order to allocate enough slots for MSC and enough slots for liens. • DWC will work with district office on hearing slot management. • It will be rolled out in conjunction with SFTP bulk filing. <p><u>Schedule going forward</u></p> <p>The purpose of this project is to provide relief to external users by eliminating the bulk of paper from scanning queues at district offices. Implementation date at beginning of project was November 2010. However, the addition of two months to the requirements timeline and one month for the DOR pending queue has set the project back three months. As a result, the project is in danger of losing its value in the present. In an effort to expedite the project from here on out, several steps will be implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Half the technical team will work on Web access while the other half works on lien conference CR 2. Once lien conference is done that portion of the team will begin working on the SFTP filing element 3. No more changes in scope will be permitted 4. Business requirements are closed 5. External users and team will meet on an "as needed" basis and will use Webinars as frequently as possible.
--	--

5.	<p>Next steps</p> <p>At next meeting DWC will give external users design for web access screen, account management strategy and revised trading partner agreement.</p> <p>Next in-person meeting will address Web access screen design, account management strategy and trading partner agreement. Date and time is to be determined. DWC will notify external partners when scheduled.</p> <p>This concludes the business requirements gathering portion of the present term solution. Technical development is on-going.</p> <p>DWC will deliver schema and error codes when ready to move forward with SFTP development.</p>	Susan Gard
----	--	------------