

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

Item Number	Submitting Organization	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Question / Comment / Issue	Question / Comment / Issue Response
	eCandidus	Jose Gonzalez	2/4/2010	<p>Terminology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Form" is missing • "Form Header" and "Form Trailer" have same definition • "Header" includes "IP Address" - This may not be available from all clients. • PLC is used in the document but never defined <p>Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • " SFTP process will mimic eForms" - Great, what does eForms look like? Can I get a login so I can learn it? 	<p>will work with tech team to get definition</p> <p>will work with tech team to get definition</p> <p>Will remove IP address from definition</p> <p>PLC will be removed</p> <p>No login but we can provide you with a hard copy</p>
	eCandidus	Jose Gonzalez	2/4/2010	<p>Since "Wet Signature" was added to the terminology, I would like to know if I can capture the physical signature (like it is now done on POS systems when you use a credit card) and physically merge it to the image of the page.</p> <p>To you it would be just as if I had printed/signed/scanned the page, so I do not see any problems but the board/judges/legal may feel different.</p>	<p>No because then it becomes a digital signature rather than a wet signature</p>

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

Item Number	Submitting Organization	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Question / Comment / Issue	Question / Comment / Issue Response
	State Compensation Insurance Fund	Joshua L. Bright	2/4/2010	<p>I note that you have also added the terms I suggested, “digital signature” and “electronic signature”, but have left the definition sections blank. I propose the following definitions:</p> <p>"Digital signature" means an electronic identifier, created by computer, intended by the party using it to have the same force and effect as the use of a manual signature. (See chapter 10 of title 2, division 7 of Cal. Code of Regs., 2 CCR § 22000, et seq.)</p> <p>Electronic signature: “Electronic signature” means an electronic sound, symbol, or process, attached to or logically associated with a record and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the record. (This definition is based on section 106 of the federal ESIGN Act. 15 USCS § 7006)</p>	<p>will add proposed definition</p> <p>will add proposed definition</p>

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Submitting Organization</u>	<u>Submitted By</u>	<u>Date Submitted</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
	Advocal	Steve Cattolica	2/5/2010	I presume that the original, high level document that you and the requirement team developed will be the starting point for Monday's discussion. Correct?	Last week at our initial meeting, we informed all that would be starting with business requirements for SFTP filing and that they would be getting the information they needed for Monday's session with the noon notes distribution on Monday.
	Essential Publishers, Inc.	Martin Dean	2/7/2010	I have not seen the "s" signature indicator before the meeting last Thursday. I now know that it's been used in the EFiling program since its inception.	Our system does not accept punctuation or special characters such as //. The S Signature is in the format of S JOHN JONES or S S JONES

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Submitting Organization</u>	<u>Submitted By</u>	<u>Date Submitted</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
				<p>But, I also know that the State Courts use a different indicator and it looks like this /s/. So I inquired about why that is being done and I was told that there are more than 100 attorneys who are members of the California Bar who have a first name that is "S" only without anything after it, and they were concerned about errors that might crop up if there was no distinguishing character to show that in fact this was a signature mark. (See code of civil procedure 1010(b)(6). The "s" they felt could also be confused with a lawyers first name unless the slashes were used.</p> <p>I believe that there is no code written around this mark, so that changing it would not entail any programming changes, but it would probably require a simple rule change. Here are two instances:</p> <p>S Robert Gilbert /S/ Robert Gilbert</p> <p>S S Scott Weiner /S/ S Scott Weiner (a real lawyer)</p>	

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Submitting Organization</u>	<u>Submitted By</u>	<u>Date Submitted</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
				See the difference. Just a suggestion which may prevent problems in the future.	See above
	eCandidus	Jose Gonzalez	2/8/2010	I was not able to make the meeting at the start, I joined just as you begun discussion on Steve Cattolica's question. What was the resolution (if any) on my use of signature capture equipment?	See Pg. 1, 2/4/10 response
	Advocal	Steve Cattolica	2/8/2010	<p>The process though which policy questions ("business requirements") will be addressed must be specified more clearly.</p> <p>During today's call, I repeatedly heard a statement to the effect that "we will take your concerns under consideration and get back to you." This statement does not engender an image of open discussion or process. Since it appears that some of the policy decisions ("business rules") began some of the most spirited dialogue, it's clear that the community was not consulted beforehand.</p> <p>I expect that the policy decision-making process includes open dialogue about these policy issues in a forum of stakeholders together with appropriate DWC staff in the way that the OCIO anticipated.</p>	

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

Item Number	Submitting Organization	Submitted By	Date Submitted	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
				<p>I request that the DWC schedule an appropriate number of policy meetings in which the agenda will consist of these policy (business) questions and where stakeholder input will be actively sought and considered <u>before</u> the policy decision is made.</p>	
				<p>An open and proactive process has proven itself time and time again. Please let us all know when these policy meetings will take place.</p>	Response emailed
	Liberty Mutual	Marc Glaser	2/8/2010	<p>general comments re today's EAMS conference call:</p> <p>1) I literally had to put my phone on the highest speaker mode and also placed my ear on the speaker to hear / understand some of the discussion. Unfortunately some was lost due to a few who are very difficult to understand.</p> <p>2) Anyone speaking at the meeting must move to a microphone.</p> <p>3) Need to speak up and be as clear as possible.</p> <p>4) Identify who is speaking every time you start talking</p> <p>5) The technical person who was speaking after the break is most difficult to understand.</p> <p>6) On the other hand, many were very clear and articulate.</p>	<p>In-room speaker to move to the phone</p> <p>Will request everyone do so - even if on phone</p>

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

Item Number	Submitting Organization	Submitted By	Date Submitted	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
				<p>7) Identify the document that is being discussed clearly and what section and page. Repeat this so everyone hears this. If the meeting is on-line and the document is seen by participants, that would be most helpful.</p>	<p>Will do</p>
				<p>8) Recommend you identify all the dates and times of the meetings / conference calls and set these up via Outlook now...as I am looking at Thursday I do not have anything scheduled. I'm out of the office but would possibly have changed my schedule knowing this in advance.</p> <p>Technical Info:</p> <p>1) I fully disagree that the SFTP the requirement all of (100%) of the documents must be electronically filed.</p>	<p>Done - meeting invites sent to all and the meetings are listed on the website</p>
				<p>2) I fully agree with the gentleman who outlined make the process effective so that everyone wants to use it but don't make it mandatory as, from our company who is a high volume operation, I can see where we would use this and most likely exceed 90-95% but it's possible it won't be 100%. This is the same issue we have with why we are not using eForms...that it's either all or nothing. If we had an option to use it when we can, we would have been using eForms from the beginning.</p>	<p>Requirement has been withdrawn</p>

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Submitting Organization</u>	<u>Submitted By</u>	<u>Date Submitted</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
	TriTek Legal	Peter Harlow	2/8/2010	Hello Robert - in response to your offer at our meeting today, I would like to be added to the list of people that you are giving access/demonstrations to about E-Forms. Thanks!	Will provide hardcopy of e-form - Please also see website main page http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/eams/ and at the bottom, click on "for e-form filers" for more information
	Essential Publishers, Inc.	Martin Dean	2/8/2010	I absolutely agree, and for the reasons stated. (In reference to the comment submitted by Steve Cattolica 02/08)	See response above
	EDD	Sean Blackburn	2/10/2010	question about "Deletion of Packet" I would like to know, when a packet is deleted due to a data validation error in one of the cases being transmitted, does it mean the entire batch job fails? Or does it mean only the transmission with the data validation error gets deleted?	CKV will detail - See also business rules
	Essential Publishers, Inc.	Martin Dean	2/10/2010	Suggestion for Meeting 3 You asked that I remind you about a request that we get a simple chart that shows the various signature requirements for the six forms that we are going to be filing. I'd like to see a chart that has headers across the top that include: Form Name: Number of Signatures Required: S Sig Permitted: Scan of Wet Sig Required: Verification Form Required	

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

Item Number	Submitting Organization	Submitted By	Date Submitted	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
				<p>This kind of chart would be so helpful. Truthfully I find some of the language describing when a sig is required and what kind, to be somewhat confusing.</p> <p>Question#2</p> <p>We are going to be making an agency policy/schema. In that Schema we are going to have to list the only forms that will be acceptable for filing (at least for the first pass).</p> <p>So, can we assume that the list of 6 EAMS forms is now augmented by the addition of:</p> <p>4906(g) declaration (if multiple as a single document)</p> <p>Fee Disclosure Statement Venue Authorization 10770.5 Verification Proof of Service</p> <p>If that is the complete list, then the schema can be designed to only successfully validate a filing that has those 11 forms in it. But I want to be sure that this list is complete.</p> <p>Question #3 Reference is made to the "From the External Requirements List"</p>	<p>The final format for the business rules has not yet been determined and we will work to see if this can be accomodated</p> <p>These are not forms - they are attachments. DWC to try to add specific Doc Titles for Venue Authorization and Lien Claim verifications</p>

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Submitting Organization</u>	<u>Submitted By</u>	<u>Date Submitted</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
				<p>These appear to be business rules that apply to all users and the DOR as well. It seems to me that any business requirement such as these must be appreciated in terms of how much code needs to be written (and how complex it might be) not only from the point of view of the Agency but of every one of your trading partners who will also have to write code (much may be very complex from the look of some proposed rules). So these rules create one-to-many coding tasks.</p> <p>OTOH I understand that as you are planning a "lights out" E filing plan (no clerk interface to accept/reject) that there must be a certain number of intelligent rules to prevent failed filings.</p> <p>To begin with, I'd love to see more information in the requirements list. I'd love to see a chart with the following headings:</p> <p>Requirement : Description: Reason for requirement: Involves the Schema</p> <p>Under reason for requirement I am not suggesting a justification of the requirement; but I think it beneficial to ask for the background of the requirement, what generated the requirement, what problem the requirement is supposed to solve etc. This way we can have an intelligent discussion of how it can be implemented because we have an understanding of the reasons for it. Requirements by fiat don't help much.</p>	<p>Our final format for business requirements will be determined</p>

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

Item Number	Submitting Organization	Submitted By	Date Submitted	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
	Essential Publishers, Inc.	Martin Dean	2/11/2010	<p>proofread #4</p> <p>We all seem to have had some learning to do about the Staff definition of “use case.” In order to continue my education, I need some help understanding why what appear to be business rules are co-mingled with what appear to be use cases beginning on Page 12 of the document entitled “EAMS Application Development and Maintenance.”</p> <p>For example aren't UC6& UC7 business rules? Isn't UC 8 a Use Case? Can't they be separated and labeled as such?</p> <p>Question #5 Is it premature to ask that the Use Case descriptions beginning on page 12, be a little more verbose. It's hard to tell what the goal or process will be without more info.</p> <p>And without that it's hard to tell whether the case is correctly applied, and impossible to determine what might be missing.</p>	<p>Robert to address at meeting</p> <p>Robert to address at meeting</p>
	State Compensation Insurance Fund	Katherine T. Borlaza	2/11/2010	<p>Court Administrator regulations</p> <p>1. A majority of State Fund mail is scanned into our claims system daily.</p>	

SFTP BULK FILING QUESTIONS / COMMENTS / ISSUES

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Submitting Organization</u>	<u>Submitted By</u>	<u>Date Submitted</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue</u>	<u>Question / Comment / Issue Response</u>
				<p>During this process, there is a "tattoo" affixed at the top of each document which shows scanned and received dates.</p> <p>Will this tattoo be allowed in the bulk filing process? For example, if we received a signed C&R and scanned it in our system, then sent it via SFTP as an attachment, will the tattoo cause an error?</p>	<p>Should be no issue/problem as these are attachments to the form(s)</p>
				<p>2. It was mentioned during last meeting that trading partners can use only one method (OCR, bulk file, or e-form) to file the 6 forms. This poses a huge problem for State Fund as not all of our adjusting locations use our electronic claims system. Will there be any flexibility to this rule?</p>	<p>This requirement has been withdrawn</p>