TRIBAL CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT SYSTEMS WORKGROUP

Session III

Joint Application Development

Final Report

October 2005

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and Families
Office of Child Support Enforcement
Division of State and Tribal Systems

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 BACKGROUND 1
1.2 SCOPE 2
1.3 PARTICIPANTS 2
1.3.1 Tribal Representatives 3
1.3.2 Federal 3
1.3.3 Session II Support Staff 4
1.4 PROCESS 4

2. JAD SESSION SUMMARY 7

2.1 JAD SESSION OVERVIEW 7
2.2 KEY ISSUES FOR JOINT APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT 7
2.3 MEETING #1 8
2.4 MEETING #2 9
2.5 MEETING #3 11
2.6 MEETING #4 12
2.7 CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS 13
2.7.1 Overview 13
2.7.2 Case Initiation 14
2.7.3 Locate 14
2.7.4 Paternity Establishment 15
2.7.5 Establishment of Support Orders 15
2.7.6 Case Management 16
2.7.7 Enforcement 17
2.7.8 Financial Management 17
2.7.9 Reports 18
2.7.10 Security and Privacy 18
2.7.11 System Architecture 19
2.8 BUSINESS RULES AND PROCESSES 20
2.8.1 Case Intake Processes 20
2.8.2 Locate Processes 21
2.8.3 Paternity Establishment Processes 21
2.8.4 Order Establishment Processes 21
2.8.5 Case Management Processes 22
2.8.6 Enforcement Processes 23
2.8.7 Financial Processes 23
2.8.8 Security and Administration Processes 24
2.8.9 Data Elements and Data Dictionary 25
2.9 NEXT STEPS 25

This page intentionally left blank.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Tribal Child Support Enforcement Systems workgroup (hereinafter called the workgroup) met for the first time in August 2002. The workgroup was chartered to recommend guidelines to maximize the benefits of automating Tribal Child Support Enforcement (TCSE) programs while limiting the fiscal impact associated with design, development, and implementation of automated systems.

During the first series of four meetings, the workgroup discussed issues with potential impact on the successful implementation of automation in TCSE programs.

The primary outcomes of the 2002 Session I meetings included:

Identification of the considerations involved in developing automated systems for TCSE programs, including acquiring and managing automated systems and services, and the related Federal funding processes.

1. Identification of high-level TCSE program automation needs, requirements, and constraints.

2. Definitions of the high-level operational capabilities required for TCSE systems.

During the second series of four meetings, the workgroup focused on functional requirements for automated TCSE systems and methods for procuring, implementing and operating these systems, in order to optimize tribal and Federal resources.

The primary outcomes of the 2004 Session II meetings included:

1. Assessment of functional software requirements for statewide child support enforcement systems as they apply to tribal child support enforcement.

2. Identification of the essential functional software requirements for a basic TCSE system, with additional software functionality determined to be conditional or optional to the operation of a basic TCSE system.

3. Detailed considerations involved in developing automated systems for TCSE programs, including acquiring and managing automated systems and services.

4. Consideration of the Advance Planning Document (APD) process applied to state systems.

5. Identification of high-level TCSE program automation needs, requirements, and constraints.

6. Definition of the high-level operational capabilities required for TCSE systems.

The final reports for 2002 and 2004 Sessions are available at:

www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/stsys/tab9.htm

1.2 SCOPE

This report summarizes the activities and results of the third series of meetings of the TCSE Systems workgroup. In this series of meetings, tribal and Federal team members focused on joint application development (JAD) of the defining hardware, software, and architecture characteristics for a Model Tribal Child Support Enforcement System, hereinafter called the Model TCSES.

The 2005 TCSE Systems workgroup met four times:

- February 7-10, 2005 in Phoenix, Arizona
- April 4-7 in Clearwater, Florida
- May 23-26, in Chicago, Illinois and
- July 18-21 in New York City, New York.

1.3 PARTICIPANTS

All JAD sessions were attended by key Federal and tribal workgroup members. Additional Federal representatives were invited to attend specific meetings.

A majority of the individual workgroup members have participated in both series of workgroup meetings. Not all tribal representatives attended every meeting, but most participating tribes sent at least one representative to each meeting.

Federal participants represented organizational components of the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE), including the Division of State and Tribal Systems (DSTS), the Division of Special Staffs (DOSS), the Division of Policy (DP), and Administration for Children and Families (ACF) regional staff. Tribal participants represented the tribes operating Tribal Child Support Enforcement programs that received Federal financial participation (FFP) under the Interim Final Rule, 45 CFR 310, and one additional tribal organization.

The Federal support team was augmented by contract technical assistance support staff from BAE Systems and Maximus, Inc., who provided technical assistance in defining and

documenting technical and system requirements. As in the first series of meetings, State Information Technology Consortium (SITC) staff arranged travel and meeting accommodations for participants.

1.3.1 TRIBAL REPRESENTATIVES

Tribal participants are listed in alphabetical order by tribe:

- Tami Lorbecke, Chickasaw Nation
- Jacqueline Pische, Forest County Potowatomi Community
- Terry Hoyt, Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians
- Karen Burke, Lummi Nation
- Tina Gouty-Yellow, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin
- Rosemund Hoffman, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin
- Kurt Nelezen, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin
- Pierette Baldwin-Gumbrecht, Navajo Nation
- Alex Largie, Navajo Nation
- Lawrence Oliver, Navajo Nation
- Harold Skow, Navajo Nation
- Sandra Starnes, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
- Linda Tresaugue, Puyallup Tribe of Indians
- Emma GreyBull, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate
- Winona Warren, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate
- Rhonda Kampeska, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate
- Keith Bowman, Tanana Chiefs Conference

1.3.2 FEDERAL

The following individuals provided a Federal perspective in one or all of the meetings:

- Jay Adams, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- Karen Anthony, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- Joseph Bodmer, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- John Cheng, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- Sheck Chin, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- Levi Fisher, HHS/ACF Region X
- James Hicks, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- Ron Logan, HHS/ACF OCSE
- Joseph Lonergan, HHS/ACF, Division of Mandatory Grants
- Angela Richardson, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- Mike Rifkin, HHS/ACF, OCSE
- Ellamae Williams, HHS/ACF, OCSE

1.3.3 SESSION II SUPPORT STAFF

The following individuals provided technical assistance or meeting support during JAD meetings:

- Jean Cost, BAE Systems
- Sheila Drake, SITC
- Ruth Hara, Maximus, Inc.
- Tom Mahony, BAE Systems
- Chris Meike, Maximus, Inc.

1.4 PROCESS

As in the prior two series of meetings, tribal participants represented a range of perspectives and experience on automation issues. Some participants represented tribes that use extensive automation in TCSE programs, while others spoke for tribes operating TCSE programs using

manual processes. In addition, workgroup members contributed opinions and viewpoints that considered the larger tribal community.

At each meeting, workgroup members addressed specific sets of issues. The group then strove for consensus from all tribal representatives on each issue and its associated sub-issues. Although several tribes, or tribal consortia, sent more than one representative, if a vote were necessary to determine a majority view, only one vote per tribe was permitted.

Meeting highlights were produced following each JAD meeting to document the proceedings, the points of consensus and the outstanding issues. Meeting highlights were distributed to all workgroup members prior to the next meeting, and reviewed by the meeting attendees.

A listserv maintained by OCSE promoted ongoing dialogue among workgroup participants.

This page intentionally left blank.

2. JAD SESSION SUMMARY

2.1 JAD SESSION OVERVIEW

The purpose of the JAD sessions and the current focus of the workgroup is to participate with the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement in creating a workable design for a model automated system for Tribal Child Support Enforcement (Model TCSES). The JAD sessions provide a forum for the current grantee tribes and tribal nations to come together to identify the business requirements and needs of their IV-D programs.

The identified needs and business requirements will then be incorporated into a general system design, which will form the framework for the design and development of a Model TCSES. After the general system design has been developed and reviewed by the workgroup, the next phase will entail the development of a detailed system design, which will identify specific system requirements for the Model TCSES.

When the general (business) design requirements and the system design requirements are complete, the next step will be to develop a prototype Model TCSES. Initially, one tribe's requirements will be used as a test of the concept and the functionality. When the pilot version is successful and working, the Model TCSES will then be given to the nine tribal grantees for more extensive testing.

All four JAD sessions followed a single agenda and process, as noted below. Each topic was discussed in detail in one meeting, then reviewed and refined in succeeding meetings until agreement was reached on the process or the product. The JAD session discussions contributed to the ongoing development of:

- Concept of operations.
- Business rules and processes, including process flow diagrams identifying the data elements and documents associated with each process.
- Definition of the data elements, documents and reports for the Model TCSES.

Information in these work products will be incorporated into the final general system design for the Model TCSES.

2.2 KEY ISSUES FOR JOINT APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT

Key issues on the workgroup's agenda included progressive discussions of the following:

1. Develop a draft concept of operations for a Model TCSES.
2. Define high level software requirements for Model TCSES.
3. Define the business processes in each key TCSE process area, including case initiation, locate, establishment, case management, enforcement, financial, reporting, security, administration.
4. Achieve group consensus on process flow diagrams, data elements and definitions, required documents and reports related to each key TCSE process area.
5. Define system architecture considerations, including tribal IT considerations, software requirements, hardware requirements, network administration and configuration, estimate preliminary level of effort, Federal Feasibility Study and impact analysis.
6. Market survey of potential resources for tribal systems.
7. Develop sample screen design requirements and develop prototype screens, forms, notices, documents, and reports.

The workgroup agreed to conduct an iterative process, discussing, reviewing and refining agreements and work products in successive meeting sessions. The meeting summaries that follow briefly touch on the results of these discussions. Detailed meeting minutes were also distributed to members during the session.

2.3 MEETING #1

The workgroup scheduled three and one-half days of effort for JAD session #1. The session began with a review of the progress and accomplishments of the prior workgroups. The workgroup agreed to use the product of the 2004 workgroup, the draft Guide for Tribal Systems, as a reference for high level software requirements. The workgroup referred to the Guide frequently in its efforts to develop a concept of operations and the business processes for a Model TCSES.

The workgroup began with an introduction to Joint Application Development and an overview of the requirements development process to familiarize all members with the roles, tools, and techniques for the four JAD sessions.

The workgroup agreed to undertake detailed discussions of the key process areas of Tribal Child Support Enforcement, including case initiation, locate, establishment, case management, enforcement, financial, security, and reports. In addition, the workgroup agreed to discuss system administration and system architecture considerations.

The workgroup agreed to conduct a two-part examination of each TCSE process area. First, the workgroup would explore and reach consensus on the specific business processes and rules. The

Federal support team would capture the agreed-upon business rules and processes as flow charts and process diagrams.

Second, the workgroup would address the data elements related to each process, reviewing and reaching consensus on the elements and data definitions.

The workgroup began its JAD tasks with an active review and discussion of a concept of operations document drafted by the Federal support team. The draft was based on discussions and findings of the first two workgroups. The JAD workgroup successively refined and modified the concept of operations over the four meetings of the current session. The key agreements and discussion points are outlined in a separate section of this report, without attributing particular points to specific JAD meetings.

Following an initial review of the concept of operations, the workgroup began discussing common business rules and processes. Of the nine business process areas, this first JAD session included detailed discussions of the first four target discussion areas (case initiation, locate, establishment, and case management), and an initial discussion of enforcement processes.

The workgroup deferred completion of the enforcement process area until the second JAD meeting in Clearwater, Florida.

Workgroup members were asked to provide examples of key documents, reports, and forms discussed during the JAD session as input to the efforts of the Federal support team.

2.4 MEETING #2

The workgroup opened this four-day JAD session with a second review of the draft concept of operations, modified to include the agreements reached during the first JAD session. The workgroup approved modifications, and discussed additional refinements in the areas of system architecture, scalability, and access. The concept of operations was to be refined further in the third JAD session.

As part of the agreed-on iterative process, the workgroup first reviewed the work products of the prior JAD session, including process flow diagrams, and related data elements and data definitions.

Process flow diagrams were produced as visual representations of the detailed workflows and key decision points identified in the areas of case initiation, locate, establishment, case management, and initial enforcement processes. Each process flow diagram included the names of documents and forms associated with the process, and in some cases, key forms and reports. Data elements and definitions had been updated for each process area.

The workgroup reviewed each flow diagram in detail, discussing and in some cases modifying a process to reach a common understanding and agreement. The workgroup agreed to review the modifications once more at the next JAD session.

The workgroup then resumed initial discussions of the business processes and rules, beginning with the remaining enforcement processes. During the remainder of the JAD session, the workgroup completed detailed discussion and initial flowcharting of enforcement, financial, reporting, and security processes.

Workgroup discussions included several topics of additional interest to members. Since six of the nine workgroup members currently operate a tribal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, the workgroup explored system capabilities to support IV-A notices, IV-A data, and IV-A/IV-D interfaces. The workgroup also discussed requirements for worklists and alerts to caseworkers, including action alerts, information alerts, and caseworker-generated alerts. The workgroup also discussed requirements for case history notations in some detail, exploring the kinds of data that should be placed into case history automatically by the system, and data that should be entered at will by caseworkers. This discussion included options for viewing or retrieving case history data.

The workgroup continued the agenda with a review of the TCSE configuration data document and discussed those items that should be configurable by each tribe as part of setting up and customizing the system for use. The workgroup determined that each tribe should be able to set or select specific data values in the areas of tribal information, CSE contact information, participant information, enforcement, timeframes, job searches, system-generated documents, automatic income withholding, financial, and security. Discussion points included:

- The workgroup agreed to defer discussion of court contact information, since some of the workgroup members belong to tribes that have multiple courts, and further discussion is required on how to handle multiple court situations.

- The workgroup agreed that job search criteria should be handled as part of case narrative information and not treated as configurable fields on the model system.

- After discussing judicial/administrative considerations, workgroup members agreed that that system should include the capability to print a signature block on form letters. The system should contain a default signature file, to be configured by each tribe during system set-up.

The workgroup conducted preliminary exchanges with the Federal support team on a range of system characteristics. Discussions served both to inform workgroup members of industry standard terms, vocabulary, and available technology, and to gather input and direction from the workgroup. Topics included system configuration and administration, compatibility issues, program constraints and assumptions, hardware requirements, software requirements, and estimated schedules and resources.

The Federal support team outlined the steps ahead on the path to secure funding to develop a Model TCSES. A Feasibility Study and Impact Analysis is necessary, including analysis of alternatives, cost benefit analysis, investigation of information technology resources, and gathering essential data. Information gathered from the workgroup members will serve as key input for the feasibility study.

As preparation for the next JAD session, workgroup members were asked to submit representative pages from the top ten or "hottest" reports in use or needed in the TCSE program, and any remaining forms or documents requested during the prior JAD session in Phoenix. Workgroup members were also asked to submit any additional changes needed to the data element definitions discussed earlier in the current JAD session.

2.5 MEETING #3

JAD session #3 agenda included three and a half days of effort. The context for the JAD session was set with an overview of the requirements development process and the function it provides in the general design for a Model TCSES. The workgroup members discussed the progress to date and the tasks remaining in the final JAD sessions and as follow-on efforts.

The workgroup continued work on agenda items with a third of four scheduled reviews of the draft concept of operations. The workgroup approved modifications in the areas of system architecture, scalability, and access. Workgroup members discussed additional refinements in the areas of billing and administration.

The workgroup continued its iterative process in reviewing the work products of the prior JAD session, including process flow diagrams, and related data elements and data definitions.

The workgroup reviewed modifications to case initiation, locate, establishment, and case management flow diagrams, documents, reports, and data elements.

The workgroup also reviewed the points in each process where decisions needed to be made by caseworkers, system users, or the system itself, and validated the decision options.

The workgroup discussed each specific instance that the system should monitor actions or elapsed time, then take an action. Workgroup members reached agreement on the process monitors, or criteria the system should use to monitor the process or trigger an action.

The workgroup continued with a first look at the process flow diagrams created in the prior JAD session, in enforcement, financial, reporting, and security processes. The workgroup reviewed each flow diagram in detail, discussing and in some cases modifying a process to reach a common understanding and agreement.

The workgroup discussed preliminary results of a market survey conducted by the Federal support team. This effort surveyed the information technology resources available in geographic areas in which the Model TCSES might be used. Part of the system design process, market survey results should help ensure that the system is developed using technology that the tribes can support with local resources and labor at a reasonable cost over time.

As preparation for the final JAD session, workgroup members were asked to provide representative pages from the top ten or "hottest" reports that are in use or needed in the TCSE program, forms or documents not already submitted , caseload and cost information, distribution

policy and procedures, and to review the list of system alerts. Workgroup members were also asked to review the forms and documents listed in the process flows, in order to identify any that are not really necessary, or any that should be added.

2.6 MEETING #4

The workgroup opened the four-day JAD session with a final review of the updated draft concept of operations document, and concurred that the concept of operations document reflects group agreements and understandings to date.

The workgroup reviewed the latest updates to process flows, and the lists of documents, notices, and data elements for all processes, including case initiation, locate, establishment, case management, enforcement, financial, reporting, and security. In this final review, the workgroup reached consensus on the structure and content of each process flow before proceeding, including process decision points, and the process monitors to be used by the system. The workgroup ensured that agreement was reached on any additional changes recommended to the Federal support team.

The Federal support team produced a large number of documents and reports based on process flow discussions and on documents submitted by workgroup members during the prior three JAD sessions. The workgroup reviewed the sample documents in detail, clarifying their intended use, identifying common points of style and structure, and developing common understandings for the guidance of the ongoing system design process.

In regard to system-generated documents, the workgroup weighed whether the system should produce a larger number of specific, easily generated documents, or a few general purpose documents requiring many choices to be made at the time of generation. The workgroup strongly favored easing the impact on the daily use by workers, rather than for ease of maintenance of the forms. Therefore, the workgroup recommended that the system include a larger number of specific documents. For the same reasons, the workgroup also recommended that documents be designed to be generated separately, rather than as multi-part packages.

The workgroup discussed and recommended creation of one or more auxiliary datasets for reference by system users, including:

- “Agency” data such as addresses of state and Federal agencies.
- “Third Party” data on employers, courts, frequently-needed addresses, service of process providers, the list of federally recognized tribes, FIPS codes, addresses for tribal programs, police agencies, and so forth.

The workgroup recommended development of the dataset(s) with an initial set of data that could then be maintained by the tribe.

The workgroup reviewed the data dictionary, making recommendations on specific elements and definitions, and their usage in TCSE processes.

The workgroup discussed and recommended reports that should be developed with the Model TCSES, including specific financial reports and management reports.

The workgroup reviewed a number of prototype screens developed by the Federal support team, and discussed how users would complete processes and navigate from one portion of the system to another.

The workgroup discussed the need to reconvene for two additional meetings to finalize general design recommendations, and expressed strong support for a continuing role as a steering committee during future phases of system development.

2.7 CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS

2.7.1 OVERVIEW

The Tribal Systems workgroup reviewed a draft concept of operations, describing the "big picture view" of the proposed Model TCSES. The concept of operations provided a high-level look at how system functions support the business processes and procedures of system users. The group discussed and agreed to a general content for the concept of operations. The concept of operations was refined in each succeeding JAD session as input to the larger system design process.

Discussion points included:

- Goals for the Model TCSES. There was consensus on four goal areas:
  - Reduce costs,
  - Be user friendly,
  - Provide flexibility, and
  - Increase caseworker efficiency.
- Architecture. Open architecture would afford maximum flexibility.
- System scalability. Scalability must be considered in balance with the increased costs of support.
- Access. Providing internet/remote access to users may not be cost effective for 'version 1' of the system.

- Payment processing mechanisms. Members agreed that the Model TCSES should support the collections and disbursement of child support payments.
- Reports. Members expressed interest in having the Model TCSES support the production of reports, but not having to actually produce all of the reports automatically.
- Interfaces. Members recommended that the Model TCSES support exchanges of files with other automated systems (FPLS, new hire, state systems).
- Performance measurements and scalability. Members agreed that the Model TCSES should be modifiable to accommodate rapid growth, but also retain ability to accommodate interface to smaller systems.

2.7.2 CASE INITIATION

Discussion points on the concept of operations for case initiation included the following:

- Agreement on the importance of a capability to identify tribal affiliation.
- Referrals include state or tribal TANF, kinship care, Title XIX Medicaid, and foster care.
- Locate-only case sources and reasons.
- Agreement on the ability to track changes in case types, including IV-D and non-IV-D cases such as kinship care, foster care (state and tribal), TANF (state and tribal), medical only, locate only, and judgment only.
- Application processes vary among members. All members have a specific intake process in place. Members discussed and identified similarities in processes and application forms.
- Members expressed interest in future capability for the system to handle electronic signatures.
- Agreement on preventing creation of duplicate cases.
- Agreement on reasons for case closure.

2.7.3 LOCATE

General discussion by the group disclosed a broad range of locate documents used by tribal IV-D programs, and an equally diverse range of locate sources that members contacted by phone, Fax, or email. However, both the length of time and number of locate attempts varies by tribe and situation.

Discussion points on case closure due to failure to locate:

- Model TCSES should allow closing cases for failure to locate, but without specific timeframes.
- Model TCSES should not automatically close cases for failure to locate.
- It would be helpful to have the Model TCSES generate inactivity alerts on cases in the locate process.
- The system should document all locate attempts in case history, tracking how often as well as how many attempts have been made.

2.7.4 PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT

Members establish paternity through a variety of methods, include voluntary acknowledgement, in tribal court, in district court, through administrative process, by default, by stipulation, and through tribal ceremony for adoptions.

Workgroup member policies vary on the handling of paternity challenges, including differences in the length of time allowed to challenge default orders or findings.

Workgroup members commonly use genetic blood testing for enrollment purposes as well as for paternity establishment.

2.7.5 ESTABLISHMENT OF SUPPORT ORDERS

Tribal child support orders are established through use of tribal court, CFR Court, state court. administrative process, mediators prior to going to court, and agreement orders. All workgroup members use petitions to establish child support orders.

Means of serving process include tribal process servers, tribal police, tribal security officers, private process servers, sheriff, voluntary service via sending a letter to the individual, court bailiff, and subpoena or summons.

Jurisdictional issues affect how cases are established. Some workgroup members exert jurisdiction over tribal members, no matter where they are in the country, based on enrollment factors. Some workgroup members consider they have concurrent jurisdiction in paternity cases when the child was born off the reservation but to an enrolled tribal member. However, once either the state or tribe begins working the case, the other entity gives up jurisdiction. In other instances, when it is decided that a state has a valid order and the tribe discovers a previous order exists, the invalid order is dismissed.

There is need for a means to indicate that processing of a case should be suspended while a determination of jurisdiction is being made.

workgroup members discussed options for court workers to access the Model TCSES, including access through system interface with the court system, and limited or read-only access to the child support system.

There was consensus that the Model TCSES should support sending a letter to the individual first, prior to personal service, and also support personal service of process.

No consensus was reached on the need for special fonts and language when printing an order, i.e., Navajo fonts for names as well as Spanish for the southern tribes bordering Mexico.

2.7.6 CASE MANAGEMENT

Workgroup members have different timeframes for case management actions and recommended that the Model TCSES be flexible enough to accommodate these differences. There was consensus on having the Model TCSES move the case to the next functional area automatically.

System ticklers or alerts that the workgroup members need include new address information, missed payments, review and adjustment activities related to the 3-year review, case closure actions related to case review, emancipation of the minor child, and anticipated order termination date.

Members track activities and actions taken on cases through use of Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, Microsoft Outlook “search” capabilities, index file cards, and service agreements with states to create download files at a cost.

Workgroup members all ascribe to Full Faith and Credit standards in processing of foreign cases

The workgroup acknowledged an ongoing enforcement issue with orders referred to states for enforcement. States often use enforcement remedies that the workgroup member are not authorized to take.

Case closure processes in place include having the case signed off by more than one person or level of authority, and sending two separate letters to the custodial parent (CP) prior to closure. workgroup members do not close a case when the CP goes off TANF until all the arrears have been satisfied.

Case closure points of consensus:

- The Model TCSES should include some kind of sign-off process by the supervisor before the case is actually closed in the Model TCSES.
- The Model TCSES should alert the caseworker 60 days after the first case closure notice is sent.

2.7.7 ENFORCEMENT

Workgroup members expressed a need to identify remedial contempt orders and track compliance with job searches and other activities associated with remedial contempt. Remedial contempt process items that might be tracked include whether the non-custodial parent (NCP) takes required action(s), follows the rules for job searches, and applies for tribal general assistance.

The workgroup agreed that generating enforcement notices and letters should remain primarily a manual process. However, the group also recommended that whenever a document is generated, the system should have the capability to create a tickler or alert.

The Model TCSES should notify the caseworker when a payment has not been received.

Enforcement remedies in use include income withholding, federal tax intercept, bank levies, liens, hunting and fishing license suspension, fishing tax, gaming license suspension, passport denial, and per capita intercept.

For per capita intercepts, information has to be tracked on the tribe, the frequency of payout, and steps that are necessary to intercept the payment.

2.7.8 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Workgroup members use simple interest, and do not charge interest on fees.

Desired Model TCSES capabilities in payment processing:

- Capability to track, distribute and disburse child support payments.
- Capability to print checks.
- Ability to support interest calculations.
- Capability to make adjustments to the account balances and allow workers to record case notes associated with the adjustments.
- Capability to set up multiple “buckets” or debts.

Some tribal child support programs accept payments directly from NCPs; others require payments to be accepted through tribal financial systems.

In-kind payments are handled differently from one program to another. However, it is generally presumed that the in-kind payments are being made unless the CP says that they aren’t. Care has to be taken to ensure that a check is not generated to a CP based on an in-kind payment. A system alert or tickler would allow a caseworker to check and see if the in-kind payment was made.

Workgroup members expressed interest in adding electronic funds transfer capabilities to their programs in the future.

2.7.9 REPORTS

Workgroup members expressed interest in system worklists or ticklers that:

- Inform the caseworker of automatic actions taken by the Model TCSES.
- Allow the caseworker to delete the alert after viewing it.
- Alert the caseworker whenever new locate information is received.
- Allow the worker to create alerts or ticklers.
- Alert when documents are generated.
- Alert for timeframe-related actions (e.g. timeframes associated with documents).

General discussions included three kinds of alerts, including action alerts (worker can delete, but if the action isn't taken, the system recreates the alert overnight), information alert (worker can delete the alert and not see it again), and self alert (tickler set by the worker as a future reminder).

Workgroup members expressed interest in having the Model TCSES access court calendaring functions

2.7.10 SECURITY AND PRIVACY

Workgroup members discussed security and privacy requirements including.

- Assignment of a system administrator to manage system security and access.
- Development of worker profiles. As part of system set-up, each tribe must develop worker profiles for system use and access. Each tribal user must be assigned a user ID as a means for the system to record and track actions.
- Passwords. Passwords must be required to access the Model TCSES. Workgroup members must determine how often passwords need to be changed.
- System access. Workgroup members must determine at what level the Model TCSES may be accessed by auditors, accounting, technical staff.

Workgroup members expressed interest in having the Model TCSES maintain audit trails, including:

- Automatic tracking of actions related to data designated as a "key element." When someone changes a key element, the Model TCSES could store the identity of the person who logged in and made the change.

- Automatic creation of audit trails in the case history.

For application security, the data base should reside with the tribe, and tribes should do periodic back-ups in case of natural or malicious damage.

Data security and system back-ups. Discussion points included the following:

- As part of the system design process, OCSE should consider creating a set of generic back-up procedures to detail how the Model TCSES should be backed up, recovery procedures and how to apply "patches" and updates to the Model TCSES.

- Each tribe should have a plan to acquire a replacement server on an immediate basis, or should maintain a back-up server.

- Each tribe must also plan for disaster recovery, including whether to provide a hot site or a cold site for system recovery.

Workgroup members must determine the need for remote access to the Model TCSES by caseworkers and staff , and by clients or customers.

2.7.11 SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

Workgroup members discussed a variety of demographic data, including number of staff, number of locations, approximate IV-D caseload, level of connectivity, access to tribal finance functions, and electronic interfaces.

Desired agency interfaces include tribal enrollment office, tribal court, tribal police, tribal TANF, tribal payroll office, tribal accounting office, and tribal hearing offices.

Workgroup members recognized that it is not possible for the Model TCSES to include built-in capability to interface with state systems, because state systems are too varied in nature. However, workgroup members should be able to develop their own interfaces independently through agreements with their state counterparts. Where a tribe elects to work with a state in developing an interface or some type of data exchange, they should ensure the interface includes a means of getting case updates.

Tribes should retain backup data for at least three years, but may retain data for longer if required by tribal procedure. If the system is the official record keeper of the financial data, payment histories may need to be retained indefinitely.

Once a tribe implements the Model TCSES, OCSE expects the tribe to commit to using the system for a specific period of time in order to make the system development effort cost effective.

When the Model TCSES is ready to be implemented, the tribe's current tribal IV-D cases need to be converted to a format usable by the system. After discussion, workgroup members agreed on an approach to data conversion in which the Model TCSES would have the capability to read a standard tribal case record which OCSE would define as part of the development effort. The workgroup agreed that it would be each tribe's responsibility to put their data into the standard record format, which could then be loaded onto the Model TCSES.

2.8 BUSINESS RULES AND PROCESSES

During this portion of each JAD session, the workgroup participated in documenting the process flows and specific business rules related to the CSE functions of intake, locate, paternity, establishment, and enforcement. Each process flow and rules were refined in succeeding JAD sessions as input to the ongoing system design process.

Key points of discussion are summarized below.

2.8.1 CASE INTAKE PROCESSES

Workgroup members noted a distinction between capture versus verification of information: information captured during Intake process would need to be verified at a later time, not during Intake. It should be a management issue for each tribe to determine the demographic data that must be entered, beyond the minimum data needed by the system to establish a case.

The workgroup discussed common and unique processes for case types of Non-IV-D, IV-D, TANF IV-D, kinship care, foster care, medical support only, foreign only, and arrears only. The workgroup recommended that any change made to case type be recorded in case history.

Workgroup members agreed on the mandatory minimum data needed to complete an application for service, including applicant, participant, and dependent data. Workgroup members agreed on the basic processes that the Model TCSES should support for each case type.

Recommendations included a case notes capability to capture information to pass along to other staff members, and creation of an employer dataset so that workers would not have to enter the same employer address multiple times.

For TANF referrals, workgroup members agreed that the same screens and information should be used as for non-TANF cases, with the addition of TANF case identifiers and Medicaid data.

Workgroup members were in agreement that the Model TCSES should look at all the data and assess where the case should go next for further processing.

2.8.2 LOCATE PROCESSES

Workgroup members were in agreement that locate processes differ from tribe to tribe. In order to identify the processes mutual to the majority of tribes, the workgroup undertook detailed discussions of the types of locate sources used, generation and content of postmaster letters, and the overlap between locate and income withholding activities. The workgroup agreed that the initial system may produce and monitor locate letters, but that other locate efforts would be done manually.

2.8.3 PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT PROCESSES

There are significant differences in how tribes process paternity cases. In order to identify the processes mutual to the majority of tribes, the workgroup discussed in detail their current processes for paternity questionnaires and affidavits, service of process, and genetic testing data and processes. To accommodate their key points of difference, workgroup members recommended that the Model TCSES:

- provide a means to record actions taken rather than to take actions automatically, and
- not enforce a set workflow through the paternity process, but offer a menu of available actions and options.

In court documents, the workgroup agreed that the system may consider case number and docket number to be the same.

2.8.4 ORDER ESTABLISHMENT PROCESSES

The number and type of documents for establishment of a child support order varies by tribe. Workgroup members agreed that when an account is set up in the Model TCSES, the system would require that a second person approve the account, affording a separation of duties.

The workgroup agreed that components of a payment may be treated by the system as separate obligations for tracking purposes. Examples include current support, arrears (to agency), custodial arrears, state-ordered arrears, child care, medical support, fees set in judgment as paternity, interest, vital record fees, court costs, genetic testing, publication fees, tribal TANF, and attorney fees.

Workgroup members agreed that the system does not need to generate a certification and verification document. If needed, the document would be treated as a standard office form.

The workgroup recommended the capability to save orders generated by the system through a mechanism such as Portable Document Format (PDF). Discussion of imaging documents not created on the system was deferred.

Guidelines calculation should be completed through use of a stand-alone module, at least for the initial iteration of the system, due to the variability of current guideline calculations. The Model TCSES should include a stand-alone module for guidelines calculations. Workers would perform guideline calculations according to tribal procedure in the stand-alone module, then enter the results into the TCSE system.

2.8.5 CASE MANAGEMENT PROCESSES

Workgroup members agreed that case history should track key data such as the change that was made, the change date, and the logged-in user who made the change. Case history should capture data automatically created by the system. Case history should also include case notes entered by workers.

In discussing tickler or worker "to do" lists, there was consensus on three types of alerts, including action alerts (system-generated notice to workers or supervisors that action is necessary), information alerts (system-generated notice that action has been taken in or by the system), and worker-generated alerts (worker-generated reminder or note to be displayed on a chosen future date).

The workgroup discussed consolidation of cases versus consolidation of orders. Workgroup members concurred with the following general definitions. Consolidation of cases is separate from consolidation of orders. To consolidate a case involves closing one case and adding persons to the other case. Court involvement is not needed to consolidate a case. Consolidation of orders requires court involvement.

In discussing review and modification of orders, Workgroup members determined that all perform at least one review every three years, and also provide reviews upon request. However, tribes vary on the specific timeframes for conducting a review, and also vary on what is considered a substantial change. There was no consensus on a common review process, but all agreed that if the person requesting the review does not return requested information within 30 days, the review action may be closed.

When an order is modified, workgroup members agreed that the order serves as the notice to both parties.

Workgroup members agreed that the first iteration of the system should include a restricted set of criteria for suggesting when case closure might be appropriate. Closing a case should place it in a "turned off" status but not delete it from the system.

2.8.6 ENFORCEMENT PROCESSES

Workgroup members recommended that the system include a mechanism to suppress enforcement remedies (and associated documents) that may not be available to tribes in general or to a particular tribe.

There was consensus that the system include capability to pursue per capita intercept or to generate documents for per capita intercept.

Workgroup members agreed that tribal licenses can be suspended without suspending state licenses and should be handled separately by the system.

Members recommended the system include a process for voluntary assignment and associated documents.

There was consensus that the system should provide for an order to appear before the elders, similar to a court order to appear, like an order to show cause.

There was consensus that the system does not need to generate an order to seize; that action may be taken outside the system or as part of a court order.

2.8.7 FINANCIAL PROCESSES

The workgroup discussed specific processes in place to receive, post, and distribute payments including direct payments. Discussion topics included fees, payment types, offset types, payment frequencies, financial notices, financial audit trail, and the timeframes associated with financial processes.

The workgroup concurred on the accounting practice of separation of duties in which the worker who creates a particular payment batch must not be the same one to post those particular payments to case accounts.

Members had ongoing and detailed discussions of distribution processes, including whether or when the system should place a priority on tribal arrears in the distribution schema. The workgroup agreed on a general distribution hierarchy, placing emphasis on current support first, arrears second, and judgments last. However, the workgroup acknowledged that distribution processes varied between tribes at the detail level, i.e., how money is distributed for foster care or kinship care cases. The workgroup also assessed the complexities presented by distribution of excess payment for arrears, where state arrears exist alone or in addition to tribal arrears.

The workgroup identified differences in how child support arrears judgments are handled differently from judgments for other costs or state fees.

Workgroup members recommended a system capability for transaction adjustments to adjust the balance where payments have been made directly, allowing the NCP to receive credit but at the same time prevent a check from being created for the CP.

The workgroup concurred in recommending that the system allow tribes to change the order of the fees hierarchy for payment.

The workgroup also agreed on processes to address seasonal work payments, i.e., the capability to post to futures when there is money left after all distribution is done.

After extended discussion of the existing variances in practice on judgments and debt collection, the workgroup agreed that the system processes should not address statutes of limitation on debt.

Workgroup members discussed the content and frequency of a variety of financial reports. It was agreed that the system would be structured to support a significant range of financial reports. It was understood, however, that the initial iteration of the system might not include development of all of the reports discussed.

Reports (and discussion highlights) included: suspended payments aging report (weekly or on demand), checks returned for non-sufficient funds (weekly), adjustments (daily and on demand within date range), stale dated warrants. state write offs, collections report, distributed collections (by debt type, etc.), undistributed collections (must include reason), disbursement summary, review and adjustment, delinquency (monthly and quarterly), arrears (quarterly), account history, income withholding, in-kind, kinship care (quarterly and on demand), foster care (quarterly and on demand), TANF case report (quarterly and on demand), bank reconciliation, collection receipt (not needed). receipt batch log and payment balance reconciliation (on demand and on line), payments within a deposit.

Members recommended that the system support (i.e., provide the data needed for) selected management reports, including the top two sections of the OCSE 34A (quarterly), tribal portions of the SF 269, program income (quarterly and on demand), annual statistical report, tribal affiliation (quarterly and on demand), new hire report (daily, weekly), as well as reports on workload statistics, case aging, case type, case actions, emancipation, cases closed, cases open with no order, paternity, intercept, and order establishment.

2.8.8 SECURITY AND ADMINISTRATION PROCESSES

Workgroup members concurred on processes to incorporate several layers of security related to system access, including initial logon and password for access to the TCSE application, with limits set for password changing and access attempts, the creation of user profiles to restrict user view and create/update capabilities throughout the TCSE system., and field-level security for critical data fields.

Workgroup members agreed that the period of time in which passwords need to be reset can be determined by the tribe during system configuration. However, lockout after three attempts is not configurable.

The workgroup reviewed and discussed the items that should be configurable by each tribe as part of setting up and customizing the system for use. The workgroup developed agreements on

the configurable data values for tribal information, CSE contact information, court contact information, participant information on race and clanship, enforcement options and thresholds, timeframes for action, document format and automatic generation options, automatic income withholding, financial functions and interest handling.

2.8.9 DATA ELEMENTS AND DATA DICTIONARY

Throughout the four JAD sessions, workgroup members reviewed each of the data elements utilized in the process flows, discussing and achieving consensus on definitions and usage. Examples include: it was agreed that at this time, the only data elements needed in the system for family violence and for good cause would be "Yes" and "No;" other information should be maintained outside the system in written files. By the end of the four JAD sessions, workgroup members had developed a mutually acceptable list of data elements recommended for inclusion in the initial iteration of the system.

2.9 NEXT STEPS

Some discussion items may need additional clarification by workgroup members, either in a future workgroup setting or through ongoing conversations with Federal support staff. These include:

- Not printing CP addresses on documents at CP request as a courtesy even if there is not enough evidence for a Family Violence Indicator.
- Primary and secondary case status as indicators to the system to push the case to the next worker appropriately. Members agreed on the concept of primary case status (paying or not) but agreed to table discussion of criteria for secondary case status. For example, an unverified address for CP or NCP might not necessarily advance a case to locate functions.
- The need for a batch process for per capita intercept. Considerations include the need to produce separate notices for individuals and a consolidated report for the court.

The next activities toward the development of a Model TCSES include completion of a Feasibility Study and Impact Analysis by the Federal support team, and developing an approach to secure funding for further phases of system design and development.