

**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 Meeting

<b>Date-Time-Location:</b>	March 18, 2010 1:00PM – 4:00PM Room 9, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor
<b>Invitees:</b>	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
<b>Optional Attendee:</b>	
<b>Facilitator / coordinator:</b>	Robert Gilbert
<b>Meeting Minutes taken by:</b>	Janet Tsao
<b>Next scheduled meeting:</b>	Mar. 25, 2010 1:00PM – 5:00PM <b>Room 15, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor</b>

<b>03/18/10 Meeting Objectives:</b>	Finalize web access business rules and SFTP business rules, and review trading partner agreement.
-------------------------------------	---

<b>Agenda 03/18/10</b>		<b>Time</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1.	Open meeting: Review previous meeting minutes	1:10		Robert Gilbert
2.	Review submitted Questions/Comments			Chuck Ellison
3.	Business rules for SFTP filing - DOR pending queue business rules			Chuck Ellison Susan Gard
4.	Break		10	
5.	User account business rules			Susan Gard
6.	Trading partner agreement			Susan Gard



	<p><u>Tab 3-15-10</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Web access business rule will add detailed description to case event as noted in the case event spreadsheet. Have consensus from group, and business rule will be updated to reflect it.</li> <li>- SFTP trading partner may file by SFTP, e-form or OCR (BR-18a).</li> <li>- Thanks to Liberty Mutual for sending in DOR pending queuing process flow diagram. DWC adopted and made modifications to it. It will be discussed in this meeting.</li> </ul> <p><u>Regarding ARS's questions on software vendor accounts:</u>        Each end user of vendor-developed software will have its own folder accessible only to them. The software vendor's transmission code is what is validated by the DWC</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Business rules for SFTP filing</b>        Reference: Proposed present term solution business rules for SFTP filing V1.5 dated March 18, 2010</p> <p>BR-03        Will not use third party filer (TPF) email addresses for any other purpose, and addressed in trading partner agreement (TPA).</p> <p>BR-05a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DWC has not provided XLM, form/field spreadsheet, and we will provide them.</li> <li>- Once name is entered, then address is mandatory.</li> <li>- Validating transmission code.</li> <li>- XML schema will be provided by DWC, external users will provide transmission code.</li> </ul> <p>BR-10c        Please provide archived cases in Excel format.</p> <p><u>DOR pending queue</u>        DOR pending queue process flow v1.1 has been added to SFTP business rules v1.5 as follows.</p> <p>BR-10e        BR-10f        BR-10g        BR-10h        BR-10i</p> <p>District offices allow walk through DORs. It is not likely for DOR in the pending queue to be cancelled; however, we want to address the issue in the event that it comes up.</p> <p>E-filers have their own processes; DOR pending queue only applies to SFTP.</p> <p>If slots become available, do the ones in the queue get process before the one that comes in the next day? Yes.        Can slots become avail middle of day? Possible, but not likely. May become available only when secretary cancels DOR.</p>	<p>Chuck Ellison /        Susan Gard</p>

	<p>DOR in the pending queue has slight priority over e-form and OCR filers of the same day.</p> <p>When slots are available, date will be calendared and notified according to preferred method of service.</p> <p>When there is a slot, it will be reflected in summary report and says filed successful, but will not give specific date.              - process of notice of hearing provides hearing date.</p> <p><b>Action item</b>  <b>Summary response will say no suitable slot avail DOR in queue. DWC will include summary response of date set once a date is provided.</b></p> <p>BR-11b              If lien claimant submitting as self, then is SFTP submitter. Must open a case opening document first, and then file DOR (see BR-11a). Third party filer is a service provider and may file lien in SFTP.</p> <p>BR-11c              Relates to page 19 of the Technical Spec doc.              Single case number may have multiple transactions, ie. C&amp;R, Stips.              Third party filers will get response and they are responsible for notifying their client.</p> <p>BR-15a              Lien claim must be filed in each case. Do not list companion cases.</p> <p>BR-18c              Includes "DOR expedited" for a satellite district office (as excluded)</p> <p>BR-19              Amend language to unify with other language using the term third party filer and its abbreviation TPF.</p> <p>BR-20              This business rule pertains to the discreet filer.</p> <p>BR-21a through BR-21i              Explicitly added the word "mandatory". If not listed as mandatory, ie 21d, then it is not mandatory.</p> <p>BR-21d C&amp;R opening              S signature is not necessary because attaching wet signature. 4906g proof of service for C&amp;R is not same as proof of service for application.</p> <p>B-12d              Re-iteration of concerns with wet signature. Hanna Brophy needs to get to digital signature to be accepted by SFTP present term solution. Hanna Brophy lawyers will digitally sign and send doc stating that digital signature on file at their offices. Hanna Brophy will email recommendation by close of business March 18 to Judge Ellison who will forward to Judge Harter for research and consideration.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>State Fund cannot move forward at this point with wet signatures and s signature only, and will need to wait until Gateway when digital signature may be accepted into the system.</p> <p>From day one of present term solution project DWC stated that digital signatures will not be accepted—they are part of the EAMS access project and the gateway—but not the present term solution. As of this point in time, the present term solution will not accept digital signatures.</p> <p>Having said that, Judge Harter is working this issue with the WCAB.</p> <p><u>Poll was taken on agreement to SFTP filing business rules.</u>        Hanna Brophy and State Fund oppose.        State Fund has not made a determination if it would file as one for all offices or if it would need folders for each of its filing locations.</p> <p>Liberty Mutual: implement study what volume is and will it be cost effective to create their own transmission interface. No issue with s signature. System (OCR form filing) as is currently is not effective for clients so regardless of whether the s signature step is more work for them, they see it as necessary to provide clients with good service. Need more analysis as to whether they can implement a transmission themselves or will bear the cost of using a third party filer (the issue is not whether they will do it, the issue is how—either their own interface or using a service); may be complete within 30 days. Sign off from home office cannot be determined.</p> <p>Zenith: E-files now. S signature verification is not deal breaker. Need more analysis; everything needs to be run through Corp.</p> <p>CAAA: Benefits at back end is huge. Every business transaction is a little bit different. Benefits for those using third party filers are big. Enormous benefit to community and gets rid of a lot of paper.</p> <p>Essential Publishers: not prepared to make decision until review schema.</p> <p>Travelers: Need to consult with general counsel. Need to have business case made.</p> <p>DWC will expedite BR-12 proof of service verification, and analysis on wet signature and possible use of digital signature. This analysis will affect our schedule. Will not ask tech staff to work weekend. Tech deliverable will not be ready by March 25.</p> <p>Liberty Mutual states cannot continue with OCR filing. Liberty Mutual still wants to file SFTP. Whether to build own interface or use another company to build the interface.</p> <p>DWC asks users to give additional comments to Robert Gilbert on this issue.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>User account business rules</b>        Reference: Web access business rule v1.1</p>	<p>Susan Gard</p>

	<p>DWC still analyze use of captcha to prevent use of BOTs on Web access page.</p> <p>DWC will create v1.2 to include general description, plus detail description and associated date(s) to case events.</p> <p>Consensus gained on Web access business rule with inclusion of general description to case events.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Trading partner agreement</b>          Reference: Electronic Adjudication Management System SFTP Trading Partner Agreement, March 2010</p> <p>This document is base on WCIS TPA and EAMS e-form filer agreement, then added previous account management session discussion of this group.</p> <p>DWC will change trading partner category of attorney to representative.</p> <p>While it is not a requirement, DWC recognizes locking down accounts to a single IP address as a best practice. Add "s" to IP addresses. DIR IS will look into feasibility of range of IP address. (Action item.)</p> <p>E-filers may use the same primary and alternate administrators.</p> <p>DWC, EDD and State Fund may address different way to designate administrators in a memorandum of agreement.</p> <p>Password reset addressed in BR-1.</p> <p>Error message "case is archived" will be sent to trading partner.</p> <p>DWC will add third party responsibility if employee with encryption key leaves company.</p> <p>DWC will include ground(s) of termination of agreement, especially if DWC may unilaterally make decision to terminate.</p> <p><u>User account</u>          DIR/DWC will accommodate a maximum of 100 accounts folders, <b>not</b> 100 end-users, initially at roll out. DWC will need to analyze level of service commitment for account creation, ie amount of accounts that can be supported going forward. External member asked for timeframe to increase maximum numbers of accounts.</p> <p>Software developers state 100 folder limitation is insufficient, saying they will have more than 100 users at roll out. DIR IS asks if they can act as a repository for their clients.</p> <p>DWC does NOT say that external users cannot sell their software—but does say how many folders it can support at go-live.</p> <p>TPA is associated with the user account folder. In the case of third party filers, they use one folder and parse out information to their clients. Packet header will differentiate which office or client of that entity.</p>	<p>Susan Gard</p>

	<p>Discreet filers could set up their accounts the same way—one folder that holds all the filings for their different offices, keeping the offices separate through the packet header information.</p> <p>There are three potential types of filers for the present term solution:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Discreet filers like State Fund: case participants who would build their own SFTP transmission pipeline and only file for themselves. State Fund could set it up so they only need one folder for themselves as an entity or they could want multiple folders (for each of their locations).</li> <li>2) Third party filers: service providers who file on behalf of thousands of clients. They get one folder (because that's their business model) but file for many.</li> <li>3) Discreet filers who buy software from a vendor: individuals or organizations who purchase software from a developer and use the software to file for themselves. We don't know how many of these folks there would be, but software developers would need to limit their clients to the largest at rollout.</li> </ol> <p>Remember, the present term solution is not the EAMS Access Project and it's not the solution for everyone.. It is designed for the 20 percent of filers who create 80 percent of the paper. This was stated in the present term solution document, discussed with external users Jan. 5, 2010. The original document is posted on the forum in the document repository and states:</p> <p>"During the process of meeting the OCIO's requirements, the EAMS External User Access Project team recognized that time is a critical factor to user satisfaction in implementation of the EAMS External User Access Project, particularly with respect to the bulk filing capability desired by frequent filers, those who use case management systems and vendors. While these "high volume" users represent approximately 20% of the user base, they file approximately 80% of the documents housed in EAMS.</p> <p>A very long wait, albeit for a technically sound solution addressing a wide range of problems, will not result in the necessary user satisfaction. Therefore, DIR/DWC's policy is to prioritize its work in a phased manner so that it meets external users' principal needs and minimizes manual processing, while moving toward the goal of full electronic access. The immediate top priority for the division and for external users is efficient electronic filing with minimal manual intervention, which will alleviate lengthy paper processing times.</p> <p>To fulfill this goal, DIR/DWC will create a "present term" solution, which will include a new bulk filing mechanism and expanded access to case file information available without a logon. This present-term solution will directly benefit high volume users who are able to immediately take advantage of bulk filing capabilities. The solution will also indirectly benefit other users still filing on paper by reducing the overall volume of paper processed at DWC district offices."</p>	
--	--	--

<b>6. Next Steps</b>	<p><u>Action items</u></p> <p>DIR IS will discuss with OTech to determine flexibility of locking down IP address within same server for different accounts.</p> <p>DWC will update Web access business rules regarding case events.</p> <p>DWC and DIR IS to analyze level of service commitment for user account creation, ie amount of accounts that can be supported by the system.</p> <p>Expedite discussion with WCAB re: digital signature.</p> <p>We will not have tech spec by March 25 but will keep March 25 meeting on calendar in case we need it.</p>	
----------------------	---	--