

**EAMS ACCESS PROJECT**  
*External Access Requirements Definition*  
*Agenda & Meeting Minutes*

<b>Project:</b>	<b>EAMS ACCESS SFTP SOLUTION</b>
<b>Meeting:</b>	EAMS Access SFTP Solution Technical Requirements am Meeting

<b>Date-Time-Location:</b>	February 16, 2010 1:00PM – 4:00PM Room 12, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor
<b>Invitees:</b> <i>(attendees in bold)</i>	Andrea Coletto, <b>Brenda Ramirez, Brian Schwabauer</b> , Camilla Wong, <b>Carolyn McPherson</b> , Dale Clough, Dan Jakle, <b>Danny Teklehaimano</b> , Denise Spelzini, Denise Yip, Dr. George Rothbart, <b>Eric Knight</b> , Gary Gallanes, <b>Gina Gariitson, Jake Greenwell, Joel Hecht</b> , Jose Gonzales, <b>Joshua Bright, Julia Burns</b> , Justin Geiger, Katherine Borlaza, <b>Kim Lincoln-Hawkins, Linda Atcherley</b> , Lorie Kirshen, <b>Marc Glaser</b> , Margo Hattin, <b>Martin Dean</b> , Matt Herreras, Oleg Katz, Paul Defrances, Pete Harlow, Renee Sherman, Richard Brophy, Ron Weingarten, Ryan Hitchings, Sandy Trigg, Sean Blackburn, <b>Steve Cattolica, Tara Lewis, Yvonne E. Lang, CKV Sa, Talat Khorashadi, Robert Gilbert; Dave Cohen;</b>
<b>Optional Attendee:</b>	
<b>Facilitator / coordinator:</b>	Robert Gilbert
<b>Next scheduled meeting:</b>	Feb. 18, 2010 1:00PM – 5:00PM Room 12, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor

<b>Meeting Objectives:</b>	Requirements Definition of the selected use case requirements
----------------------------	---

<b>Agenda</b>		<b>Time</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1.	Open meeting: Review previous meeting minutes, Affirm receipt of terminology draft document	1:05		Facilitator
2.	Consensus on Calendar changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancelled sessions</li> <li>• Scheduled sessions</li> </ul>			Facilitator
3.	Review Ground Rules			Facilitator
4.	Discuss document repository <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document version control</li> </ul>			Facilitator
5.	Review submitted questions/comments			Facilitator
6.	Review parking lot issues within the scope of the present term solution but out of the timeline			Facilitator
7.	Review parking lot issues outside the scope of the present term solution but which we want to capture for the EAMS access project			Facilitator
8.	Business Requirements review			Business Requirements Team

**EAMS ACCESS PROJECT**  
*External Access Requirements Definition  
 Agenda & Meeting Minutes*

	<b>Agenda</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Owner</b>
9.	Review/Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1 Present Term Requirements – Must have requirements</li> <li>• 3.1.1 EAMS Business Use Cases List</li> <li>• 3.2 EAMS SFTP Bulk Filing Technical Use Cases</li> <li>• 3.2.1 Acknowledgement</li> <li>• 3.2.2 EAMS Batch Form Process</li> <li>• 3.2.3 SFTP Transmission</li> <li>• 3.2.4 Layout</li> <li>• 3.2.5 Other Technical Activities</li> <li>• 3.3 EAMS Technical Use Cases Mapping</li> </ul>	2:15	20 min	DIR IT Team
10.	Break	2:35	10 min	
11.	Use Case discussion cont'd 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.	2:45		DIR IT Team
12.	EAMS Present Term Technical Specifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• version 1.2</li> <li>• added <b>Section 4</b> and <b>Appendices D and E</b></li> </ul>			DIR IT Team
13.	Proposed layout structures	3:30		DIR IT Team

1.	<p>Participants agreed to skip reading and review of previous meeting's minutes.</p> <p>Julia Burns volunteered to take minutes.</p> <p>Reminder of ground rules, in particular time keeping.</p>	Susan Gard
2.	<p><b>Questions/Comments reviewed.</b></p> <p>Martin Dean requested that all PTS document names include a revised date or version number to quickly distinguish the latest version of any document. Also, he asked for a common document repository.</p> <p>Linda Atcherley had many comments, summarized below (the DWC response for most of the comments referenced the filing demo at the last mtg by Joel and Cathy):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appears that many participants do not understand EAMS filing</li> <li>• Reminded that all filing is governed by existing regulations, and in particular, the regulations dictate the sequencing of certain forms</li> <li>• Suggested a 24-hour wait time between filing a lien and DOR.</li> <li>• 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></li> <li>• Reminded that PTS solution is subject to existing limitations of current EAMS processing of documents. <i>Judge Ellison agreed, with the exception of a complete error message in the PTS.</i></li> <li>• Suggested at real-time demo of filing in EAMS <i>Judge Ellison says this is possible with Webex</i></li> <li>• Suggested participants go through the CBT (Computer Based Training program required of each EAMS external user trial admin)</li> </ul>	LONG TERM PL

<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Questions/Comments reviewed, cont'd</b></p> <p>Linda Atcherley comments, cont'd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiated between fatal errors that prevent submission, compared to subsequent errors that trigger a doc to the UDQ.</li> <li>• BATCH ID is a receipt for successful submission, not successful processing into EAMS.</li> <li>• Differentiated between fatal errors that prevent submission, compared to subsequent errors that trigger a doc to the UDQ.</li> <li>• BATCH ID is a receipt for successful submission, not successful processing into EAMS.</li> <li>• Failure to provide SSN may cause wrong Injured Worker name to be associated with the case. <i>Judge Ellison clarified that the SFTP filer would receive the Notice of Application and would then need to email the UDQ operator with requisite information to correct the filing.</i></li> <li>• How will UDQ documents be resolved electronically? <i>Judge Ellison explained that all SFTP filings that failed validation would be deleted and not processed in the EAMS batch process</i></li> </ul> <p>Jose Gonzalez submitted detailed info re: digital signatures. <i>DWC advised that digital or electronic signatures are outside the scope of the PTS..</i></p> <p>Julia Burns submitted Use Case comments, but the attachment was not rec'd.</p> <p>Martin Dean submitted a comment that defined general goals and tasks. <i>DWC took comments under advisement.</i></p> <p>Daniel T. suggested to CKV that the use cases be modified with the intent to minimize confusion. <i>CKV did modify his use cases.</i></p> <p>Ryan Hitchings needed a definition of trading partner. <i>Judge Ellison defined a trading partner as the entity (individual or office) that has chosen to submit documents by SFTP.</i></p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Business Requirements reviewed</b></p> <p>Business requirements will be transferred to spreadsheet format.</p> <p>Susan Gard advised that the opportunity for comment on business requirements is now – there would be a clear request for final comments and sign-off of the finished business requirements spreadsheet. Comments on spreadsheet should be submitted by 10 a.m. Wednesday.</p> <p>More than one participant requested that PTS sessions be spaced further apart, to allow participants time to review documents and prepare comments prior to the day of the session. <i>DWC took suggestion under advisement.</i></p> <p>Judge Ellison reviewed the Business Requirements document.</p>	<p>ACTION ITEM</p>

<p><b>4. EAMS PTS Technical Requirement document, Use Cases</b></p> <p>CKV reviewed format and content revisions to the EAMS PTS Technical Requirements document.</p> <p>3.1 Present Term Requirements – Must have requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CKV will add sequential numbering of rows, per Martin's request, even though the sequential numbering was only removed per Martin's request at a previous meeting.</li> </ul> <p>3.1.1 EAMS Business Use Cases List</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The source document for this list was the work product of the requirements sessions over last summer, now attached to the EMAS PTS Tech Spec as Addendum B.</li> <li>• Participants shall review Addendum B and submit via email to Robert, any additional use cases to include, or any comments regarding use cases already included in the table.</li> </ul> <p>3.2 EAMS SFTP Bulk Filing Technical Use Cases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each UC now starts w/verb and the fact that EAMS is the actor, is known.</li> </ul> <p>3.2.1 Acknowledgement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 = receipt of submission (similar to receiving a batch ID when filing via e-Forms)</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Level 3 = successful submission. Summary report of forms and attachments from a single packet that filed successfully into EAMS, via batch process.</li> </ul> <p>UC 3 &amp; 4 should be merged.</p> <p>UC 8 should be broken down, since a Lvl 1 and 2 ack would apply to an entire packet, but a Lvl 3 ack might apply to only a single transaction from a packet. <i>DWC took comment under advisement.</i></p> <p>UC 10        Judge Ellison indicated that this UC should be removed because all parties should be allowed time to receive data mailers of new case openings before subsequent filings (ie: DOR).</p>	<p>ACTION ITEM</p>
---	--------------------

	<p><b>EAMS PTS Technical Requirement document, Use Cases, cont'd</b></p> <p>3.2.2 EAMS Batch Form Process</p> <p>UC 7 &amp; 12 should be merged.</p> <p>UC 21 &amp; 22 should be merged.</p> <p>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.</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>UC 36 needs companion UC for submitters</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 will send out the form field validations spreadsheet to assist participants.</i></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>PARKING LOT (definitions)</p> <p>PARKING LOT</p> <p>PARKING LOT</p> <p>PARKING LOT</p> <p>PARKING LOT</p>
--	---	--

**EAMS ACCESS PROJECT**  
*External Access Requirements Definition  
 Agenda & Meeting Minutes*

	<p><b>EAMS PTS Technical Requirement document, Use Cases, cont'd</b></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><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Agenda Items for Next Session</b>          CKV proposed layout structures for discussion. <i>Form field validations spreadsheet requested again.</i></p>	