

Project:	EAMS PTS
	LONG TERM PARKING LOT

	<p>Carolyn M. asked about the submission of DOR question submitted 2/17: Robert read Chuck's response to the question in which he stated that SFTP filers won't have the same date-set functionality as when they're logged online into EAMS/Curam. If a DOR has not received a hearing date after 1 week, the filer must contact the helpdesk.</p> <p>It was agreed that this issue needs to go to the Parking Lot for further consideration by DWC next week.</p> <p>The following parking lot items are still pending:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will date selection be handled for FTP DORs? <i>Judge Ellison responded that the first avail date is assigned, unless there are no available dates. If there are no avail dates, that is a FATAL ERROR and the filer must re-file the DOR until dates are added. Current e-filing procedure requires the filer to attempt filing the DOR for at least 7 days, after which the EAMS Help Desk may be emailed with a request for add'l dates. There was discussion regarding the concern that DORs, whether submitted by OCR, e-forms, or SFTP should all have equal access to avail dates. Participants perceived advantages for OCR filers, where a clerk might add dates, then assign dates to pending OCR DORs already rec'd at the district office. Judge Ellison advised this rarely happens. Electronically filed DORs are more likely to have the advantage of obtaining dates. Furthermore, DOR-Expedited are handled differently than regular DORs, and any DOR filed by an Injured Worker (In Pro Per) is handled with highest priority per regulations. Participants wanted to see consistency in assigning dates. Participants requested that DORs be queued in order of date/time submitted, pending available dates, but this functionality is not currently available in EAMS and would likely be another change request. The "pending DOR" issue was added to the Long Term Parking Lot. Brian from State Fund asked whether service of a submitted DOR should be delayed until a date is rec'd?</i> 	
--	---	--

This issue is resolved in SFTP business rules BR-10e through BR-10i

SHORT TERM PARKING LOT	
<p>3.2.2 EAMS Batch Form Process UC 23 Remove term “submitted” and use a more specific word. Definitions of “lodged date,” “submitted date,” and “business date” are needed.</p> <p>UC 34 Martin requested that Levels 1 and 2 acknowledgements be consolidated into a single response and that all acknowledgements be sent separately for each form filed. <i>DWC advised that the filer controlled how responses were sent; that is, if a filer sends several transactions in a packet, the response would summarize errors for all transactions in that packet, but if a filer sends only one transaction per packet, then the response would summarize errors for only one transaction.</i> During the session, participants voted not to consolidate any levels of acknowledgement.</p> <p>Martin requested <i>to be able to send multiple transactions in a packet, but receive responses already parsed out per form.</i> Other participants agreed that this could be useful. <i>DWC put this in the parking lot.</i></p> <p>3.2.3 SFTP Transmission Martin inquired about status of <i>user logins and passwords.</i> 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>The term submitted is used and will be included in the terminology section of the technical specifications document.</p> <p>No action needed.</p> <p>Packaging must be done according to response needs. DIR/DWC will not accept responsibility for parsing responses</p> <p>Final validations will be provided in the technical deliverables.</p>
<p>Business Requirements reviewed</p> <p>Many of the parking lot items will be covered in the revised document. Judge Ellison added <i>Archived Cases</i> to the parking lot.</p> <p>The Cover Sheet fields will be cleaned up as requested last session. This should be finished by next week.</p>	

4.	<p><i>22) Provide the ability to file documents under seal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is "under seal"? • Under seal – an external user must submit a petition via unstructured form, to seal certain items such as documents or body parts. The judge would review. • This item is outside the scope of PTS. • Joel Hecht offered that the genesis of this item is related to 3rd party filers, and whether a TPF is able to view the contents of sealed documents, etc. • Judge Ellison reminded that since these petitions are unstructured filings and not approved for SFTP filing, this item remains clearly outside the scope of PTS. 	<p>This item is outside the scope of PTS.</p>
----	--	---