

EAMS ACCESS PROJECT
External Access Requirements Definition
Agenda & Meeting Minutes

Project:	EAMS ACCESS SFTP SOLUTION
Meeting:	EAMS Access SFTP Solution Technical Requirements Meeting

Date-Time-Location:	February 26, 2010 1:00PM – 3:00PM Room 12, 2 nd Floor
Invitees:	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;
Optional Attendee:	
Facilitator / coordinator:	Robert Gilbert
Meeting Minutes taken by:	Ira Phillips
Next scheduled meeting:	Mar. 3, 2010 1:00PM – 5:00PM Room 10, 2 nd Floor

02/26/10 Meeting Objectives:	Discuss business rules, external user submitted use case statements, the canonical data model, and error codes and messages.
-------------------------------------	--

Agenda 03/03/10		Time	Duration	Owner
1.	Open meeting: Review previous meeting minutes	1:10		Robert Gilbert
2.	Review submitted Questions/Comments			Susan Gard
3.	Review Web access proposal			Susan Gard
4.	Discussion Web access proposal			Susan Gard
5.	Review Web access business rules			Susan Gard
6.	Discussion Web access business rules			Susan Gard
7.	Break		10	
8.	Review SFTP business rules			Susan Gard

03/03/10 Meeting Objectives:	Discuss Web Access.
-------------------------------------	---------------------

<p>1.</p>	<p>Open meeting: Review previous meeting minutes</p> <p>Participants agreed to skip reading and review of previous meeting's minutes.</p> <p>Participants agreed to limit meeting to 2 hours due to EAMS production problem – CKV needed to participate in late afternoon problem resolution meeting.</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<p>Project Milestones</p> <p>There was no discussion about milestones. Robert G. asked the participants to look at the website for information about milestones. Martin D. asked to have the spelling of milestone – “millstone”, corrected.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Review documents posted on Forum</p> <p>Robert G. stated that we're trying to maintain the current versions of documents at the site. He asked the participants to review the documents and to get back to him with questions or corrections. He also asked that participants review the documents prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The participants said that it was sometimes difficult to determine the most current version of a document and requested that version numbers be added. CKV said we'd address this on Monday, 3/1.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Review submitted Questions/Comments</p> <p>It was noted that the Questions and Comments document wasn't included in the distribution of documents for this meeting.</p> <p>Therefore, in order to review recently submitted Q&C, Robert G. asked the participants to look at the website Forum Q&C document for date 2/22.</p> <p><u>Questions submitted 2/17:</u> --Carolyn M. asked about the submission of DOR question submitted: 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>--Brian S. brought up the issue of managing the SFTP filer's queue. He stated that the onus appears to be on the managing partner, and he takes issue with that. He feels the trading partner is being asked to do DWC's job of improving the efficiency of the Present Term Solution.</p>	<p>Parking Lot Issue</p>

<p>4.</p>	<p>Review submitted Questions/Comments (continued)</p> <p>--Another participant asked if each customer is considered a trading partner; i.e., if a vendor has 1000 clients, is each client considered a trading partner, or just the vendor.</p> <p>--In reference to table 3.2.1 Acknowledgment, UC10 - several questions were posed, and Chuck responded to each question. But participants are still dissatisfied with some answers. Robert asked participants to get back to him with their concerns.</p> <p>--A participant asked what % of SSN's are being entered into EAMS. CKV responded that because SSN is not a mandatory field, there isn't a high percentage entered on forms.</p> <p>Josh B. mentioned that Walter Sensing provided SCIF with excellent pre-EAMS DWC data showing that forms then contained a high % of SSN's.</p> <p>--Martin D. asked a question about the Bulk Filing forms spec table. He still doesn't know what the letter designations in the 3rd column refer to. Robert said he'd respond to this at the next meeting.</p> <p>--Josh B. said that it's not a deal breaker if DWC can't accommodate the 2 GEF's format for the Present Term Solution. CKV explained why we're going to use standard XML for the PTS. There are 2 main reasons for this: 1) there's no time to do a meaningful impact analysis of the 2GEF's format on EAMS processing; and 2) using standard XML conforms to the project rule to be consistent with current processing standards.</p> <p>--Josh B. remarked about Chuck's comment regarding wet signatures. He said Chuck had no authority to make his statement since it's not defined by statute.</p> <p>--Martin D. said that statements were truncated in the 2/22 Q&C document. Robert said this was due to PDF limitations when an Excel document is converted to a PDF.</p> <p><u>Questions submitted 2/22:</u> No discussion.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Business Rules</p> <p>Robert quoted Susan Gard as stating that the existing Business Rules document – “Proposed PTS Business Rules for SFTP”, constitute the final draft. If any participants disagree with the BR's, they must advise Robert in writing by 10am Tuesday, 3/2. If no concerns are forthcoming, DWC will view this as acceptance of the BR's.</p> <p>--Josh B. asked when the Trading Partner agreement will be available for review. Robert will respond to this next week.</p>	

6.	<p>External User Use Case Statements</p> <p>This document was created by Brian Schwabauer and Danny Teklehaimano.</p> <p>--CKV asked about Use Case #5 - who has to register as an EAMS trading partner. Brian said this is still a question. CKV would like to remove it.</p> <p>--Brian S. asked if there were any questions about his design, specifically regarding security. CKV said security would be addressed at a future meeting.</p> <p>--Josh B. emphasized that the security document/process will need to be frozen to allow a full SCIF risk assessment.</p> <p>--Martin D. asked 2 questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will DIR provide validation codes? CKV said yes, within a month. 2. When will DIR provide a schema or schema draft? March 11; schema signoff will be March 18. <p>--Danny T. requested that we publish validation rules. CKV said they have been published.</p> <p>--Susan (EDD) asked about Use Case #8. CKV responded.</p>
7.	<p>Review Tech Spec Canonical Data Model</p> <p>--CKV made a short presentation of new section 4.4 Canonical Data Model in the Technical Specifications document. He explained the model by discussing the diagram on page 31. CKV asked the participants to review section 4.4 and provide him with feedback.</p> <p>--Martin D. said he thought his company's Electronic Filing Manager would work with the Canonical DM. Robert suggested he talk to Dave Cohen about this.</p> <p>--Martin D. asked how the DIR XML namespaces would handle the DM approach. CKV explained that there are inconsistencies in the DIR forms that the Canonical DM addresses. He said we would try to freeze the model by March 18.</p> <p>--Participant voiced concern about the validation rules within the DM. For example, will nulls be allowed.</p> <p>--Martin D. asked us to provide a better description of min/max fields.</p> <p>--Danny T. asked how we will show validation rules. CKV answered: on the Form DM.</p>

7.	<p>Review Tech Spec Canonical Data Model (continued)</p> <p>--Martin D. asked if we could publish the Namespace for the Form. CKV said we will try.</p> <p>--CKV said participant feedback on the Canonical DM was needed by March 3.</p>
8.	<p>Review Tech Spec Error Codes and Messages</p> <p>--CKV explained the 3 levels of error checking and validation.</p> <p>--Martin D. said he thought that the proposed error codes had too many zeroes. Some funny comments were made about this. CKV said he might reduce the number of zeroes.</p> <p>--CKV wanted the participants to understand that the error list could be impacted by periodic EAMS releases. For example, a change request could alter or add a new error code. Users voiced concern about changing an error code. They said they preferred adding new error codes to changing them. CKV said this would be reviewed.</p> <p>CKV is reviewing "level error" processing. He will provide a draft version of this on March 11.</p>
9.	<p>Next Meeting(s) Agenda Items:</p> <p>--Next session will focus on Web Access. Meeting is Wednesday, March 3. This is the only meeting next week.</p> <p><u>Future Sessions:</u> March 9 - Security and Certification March 11 – Final Web Access Meeting; Specs handed out March 18 – Final Draft of Specs for User Sign-off</p>