



Cynthia A. Rice

08/11/98 07:54:35 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP, Andrea Kane/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: Two technie child support rules to go final before Aug. 22nd

There are two very technical child support rules that will go final between now and Aug. 22nd (both were proposed in March in nearly the same form). Both relate to the \$400 million provided in the Personal Responsibility Act for child support computer systems. One simply finalizes the state formula for the funds. The other specifies what sort of Advanced Planning Document states must submit in order to get these funds. Under Keith Fontenot's guidance, OMB added safeguards to the rule last March to try to head off future state state computer systems problems, requiring states to meet milestones of progress to continue to get funds and to obtain review from independent computer systems experts.



Laura Oliven Silberfarb
08/10/98 12:25:26 PM



Record Type: Record

To: mmocko @ acf.dhhs.gov @ inet

cc: Edwin Lau/OMB/EOP, Timothy R. Fain/OMB/EOP, Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP

Subject: child support comments.

Maddi, please give me a call so we can discuss the strategy for clearance by Thursday.
Thanks.

Child Support Systems Rule

1. p. 30,31 -- Page 30 refers to mandatory triggers for the IV&V contractor. The paragraph on page 31 references "based on this review, OCSE may determine that a State must obtain IV&V services...." Is this in addition mandatory triggers? Please clarify for us and in the preamble. [Add: "Also with respect to this last item....." to top of paragraph on page 31.]
2. p.31 first paragraph -- Delete "Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V) from last sentence. Also, please delete the IV&V references on the top of page 35.
3. p. 34 second paragraph -- "OCSE will, in close consultation with the States, assess the value, need for and type of an IVV appropriate." ACF's agreement with OMB is that when a trigger is reached, an IV&V contractor will be procured. This is not subject to any further assessment. Please revise this language accordingly.
4. The response on page 77 should mirror the preamble language in the second paragraph on page 31 exactly. (Use of an independent State contractor is only allowable in a pre-existing contract.)
5. p 112, item (I) -- is there any reason why information on administrative actions and proceedings will not be included in the systems requirements?
6. p. 115, new item -- insert [This language was in the NPRM change sheets, but was not in the final version.]:

307.13(a)(3) -- Permit access to and use of data for purposes of exchanging information with State agencies administering programs under titles IV-A and XIX of the Act to the extent necessary to carry out State agency responsibilities under such program in accordance with section 454A(f)(3) of the Act.

Does this new item also refer to agencies in other States carrying out the Act?

7. p. 111 of the draft reg -- item (4) does not contain the "required under paragraph (e)(2) of this section" contained on page 63 of the markup.

8. p. 113 of the draft reg -- item (1) is very different from the language provided on page 66a of the marked up version.

9. p. 114 of the draft reg -- item (xiv) retains the "as set forth in instructions issued by the Office." The markup deletes this.

10. p. 115 of the draft reg -- there is no item (a)(3) as proposed in the marked up version. This language "permits access to and use of the data for purposes..." and is found on page 69 of the markup. Please reinstate.

11. p. 118 item (B) -- believe it should read "Periodically review and make recommendations on the management of the project by both the State and the Vendor, as well as the technical aspects of the project."

12. p. 118 item (E) -- delete "a".

13. p. 119 Section 307.30 -- should we expressly mention funding available for the IVV contractor? The Preamble needs to be addressed as well as does page 89 question 17.

14. p. 77 Third Paragraph beginning with "First, we would ..." -- needs to stress the independent nature of the IVV entity -- regardless whether it is a QA or an IVV organization.

In previous discussions with OMB HHS agreed to:

Revise the "DHHS State Systems Guide" to include more information on the planning milestones. This has not occurred as of yet.

To provide quarterly (or so) updates on State systems development progress, including whether an IVV contractor is being used and what the contractor is doing/saying.