

2003 NATIONAL UI DIRECTORS' CONFERENCE AND LEGAL ISSUES FORUM

OCTOBER 20-23, 2003
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

The NASWA UI Directors was held in Savannah Georgia. The Conference hosted 21 workshops on various UI topics and issues and had a number of plenary session speakers. The following is a report from the Workshops and other presentations.

UI Committee Meeting Notes

The committee began the discussion with Dale Ziegler reporting that USDOL had funded a study regarding the Information Technology Support Center. The Gartner Group performed the study. The report had been received by USDOL the previous week. USDOL was not prepared to discuss the findings at this point. The report was going to be a part of an evaluation of whether the ITSC should continue to be funded. The findings in the report will be released as soon as USDOL can get them released.

Dale also reported that there was some movement on UI Performs. He felt that there was a need to have at least one more meeting with the NASWA workgroup to get it finalized. He stated that DOL was ultimately trying to tie RJM to the UI Performs process.

Finally, Dale stated that USDOL was seeking opportunities for NEG grants for ATAA implementation money. He was clear that this is not set in stone.

Plenary Sessions Notes

Kelly Services and Georgia Pacific indicated that they supported legislation making SUTA dumping illegal. The Georgia Pacific person indicated that the objection to the current bill being considered in the congress is that it requires the state to make a judgment call on the reason for transfers of employees/successorship transactions, as states are not qualified to make such as judgment.

The Georgia Pacific person also recommended states look at totality of discipline history when determining eligibility for benefits by ruling a separation issues. This was especially true in the case of absenteeism issues.

USDOL indicated that new confidentiality regulations for state UI programs are targeted for publication in the federal register in June 2004.

Staff from the state of Nevada agency gave a presentation on how they are using ONET and ONET Code connector to improve the quality of matching services to UI claimants. They have quantified a reduction in benefit duration of 2.3 weeks for claimants receiving reemployment services. This process is done through the UI call center. The success is due to a good training program, quality reviews, the software, and the use of ONET experts (referred to as code talkers) in call centers. Call centers are given menus sorted by job title or occupational title to facilitate finding a code. The codes have job descriptions behind them to better ensure the accuracy of the code and the quality of the match.

**Workshop: Identity Theft
Investigating & Prosecuting Identity Theft**

Panelists: Deborah Bronow: California, Moderator
Pete Iseberg: ADP, Presenter
Abel Salinas: OIG, Presenter
Kathy Ramoska: Washington, Presenter

Criminals can change their MO faster than states can change their UI systems.

Currently there are two types of identify theft:

1. Base Year wages earned by filer, but using another social security number. Federal statute permits the use of social security formulas to determine what social security numbers have not been issued. Washington is using this as a method to detect on the front end.
2. Base Year wages and social security numbers do not belong to the filer.

The first time identity theft was identified was by a person that filed and was told that their benefits were expired.

Ways to get data; steal from companies or dumpsters or just buying records from Farm Worker Contractors.

The checks are obtained using a PO Box or paying rent on an apartment and paying a runner to pick up the mail at the apartment. Easy targets are migrants. They move a lot and may not come forward. Fictitious last employer, post office boxes, and wage earners, were sent to another state for cashing but received in the disbursing state issued. Claimants are not stamping, check for deposit or signing as a means to avoid prosecution.

California has had small market be a part of the theft process by serving as the launderer of the money for a fee that has been as large as 30%.

Prevention tools are 100% social security cross match (no effect on first program timelines) with the social security administration. This is a three-day to batch process. Within the first year, \$11M in overpayments were prevented to 2500 UI claimants. This is front end so no overpayment occurred.

Telephone staff is trained on potential fraud detection methods and referral to investigations. Within days after filing, messages are sent to base year employers. Responses from these employers assist in fraud detection.

Washington uses a Data Mall to mine their data. Data searches are conducted on address, telephone numbers, fictitious last employers, city, and zip code searches. This has been helpful in the detection.

Collection Methods – Wage earner makes an affidavit of forgery and then the state charges back through state bank to local bank and then to the account holder or laundering store. OIG can seize property and accounts. Telephone caller ID is a good tool. (One question is do we have the ability to have caller id for our call agents and could we track to see if multiple claims are being phoned in from one number, and would this be a good tool in Ohio?)

Future tools looks great with additional cross match with Washington State Department of Licensing (BMV). Washington State BMV does not sell SSNs to anybody. National legislation to allow state design and sign affidavit of forgery is another potential tool. Software linking key information in Data Mall called the Lexis Nexus project is being implemented with three states.

The additional comment from the OIG was that they are discovering that there is almost a franchising operation in this arena on the west coast. They suggested that states get proactive in the notification of their employers to verify things like charge statements to help combat this issue.

The ADP person indicated that the employer community is not ready for this issue. Computer files and CD ROMs make the information far too portable. He thought that delayed notice to base period employers and minimal authentication of claimant identity were contributing. He recommended that employers remove all unnecessary personal information be from screens and reports. He also encouraged states to use crossmatches to help with authentication.

Workshop: Resource Justification Model

Panelist: Fred Suwe; Nevada, Moderator

Tim Felegie: USDOL, Presenter

Felegie indicated that Congress adopted a workload standard for the next budget year that should guarantee 100% funding of contingency workload. They also thought that 2003 contingency funding would be raised from the current 84% to 89%. The adjusted 2003 amount will appear in the 4th quarter contingency funding.

It was reported that the RJM tool is being used as a data collection tool and not a budgeting tool. This is due to the fact that projected appropriation levels are less than what RJM suggested that full funding requires. This is creating the need to continue to tweak the formula to put all states on a level playing field when the appropriations for UI Administrative funds are passed down to the states. For example, state funds supplementing the program was a part of the formula for calculating state funding amounts. This will no longer be the case as there are many states that did not receive state funding. Based on the latest targets supplied by USDOL, Ohio will be funded at a level that is approximately \$103,000 less than 2003 levels. The decision to exclude state funds from the calculation probably cost Ohio a few million dollars in its 2004 administrative funding level.

Workshop: UI Performs & SQSP

Panelists: Tom Whitaker: Moderator, North Carolina

Jeffrey Wells: Colorado, Presenter

Dale Ziegler: USDOL, Presenter

Pete Cope: Pennsylvania, Presenter

The core measure is defined as a short list of measures that gauges performances in critical functions of UI and general overview of performance. The measures need to be sufficient for the Secretary to certify states as substantially compliant in the way that the state runs its program.

Tier II is being eliminated and replaced by federal/state management information for use by both the federal government and state agencies. This will not be published for comparison purposes. This level will include all Tier II from today and original Tier I not in existence after the implementation of the new system. These elements will also be sufficient to assure feds that a state is meeting federal standards and regulations.

Management Information will not require Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Core measures will require a CAP. SQSP or CAP will be required for both. DOL can require CAP even if not core.

The Core Measures will be timeliness and quality standards for benefit payments, tax operations, and appeals. A new measure regarding benefit overpayments will be coming. Another outstanding issue is related to the incorporation of a Reemployment Measure.

There will be another meeting with NASWA workgroup to finalize the proposal. This will be published in the form of

a UIPL and in the Federal Register as a change public notice of rulemaking, and a final review.

Workshop: HCTC Lessons Learned

Panelists: Pat Power: Moderator, Ohio and Substitute Presenter for Laura Boyette, Maine
Connie Carter: USDOL, Presenter
Julie Crom: Accenture (IRS Subcontractor), Presenter

It was noted that there are approximately 25 states that do not have a qualifying private health insurer involved in this program. Ohio is one of the leads in this. It was interesting that Maine did similar steps to our state involving the Governor's office and Department of Insurance early. Maine also has gone to extra lengths to involve stakeholder groups in communication groups to be sure that communications about the program to potential eligibles is getting out. Maine is tracking issues such as eligibility issues that arise with the program. The tracking of these issues put them in the best position to communicate to their congressional delegation for potential technical amendments. Maine has also developed a screen that is used for locals to answer local eligibility type questions. The number of calls to the central office has dropped dramatically since the screen was put into production. Something like this may be helpful in our state as we move more towards integrating one-stop partners into our service delivery system.

USDOL laid out the published operating guidance memos. These memos can be viewed at http://www.doleta.gov/tradeact/2002act_index.cfm. They were particularly challenged by the implementation schedule laid out in the law. USDOL reported that all states reported eligibility data on time. There are many questions as to the reliability of the data. They encouraged states to develop quality control reviews. Accuracy is important for all eligibles to take advantage of the program at the earliest possible moment. Examples of quality control reviews could be big swings in the number of eligible people in the daily reporting. USDOL also reported that any cost in producing the ATAA stuff should be NEG related and not the UI grant.

The IRS person laid out the workflows currently being employed and indicated that it takes up to 60 days to get a person fully enrolled for the advance option. Individuals should avoid loss of eligibility for a period not to exceed 62 days to avoid another waiting period for the advance option. They indicated that there are about 200,000 people potentially eligible. It was reported that participants that lose eligibility for one or more months must reregister to take advantage of the credit. This is also the case if a person goes from being a TAA person to a PBGC person. Participants can reregister within the same year as long as they remain eligible. It is thought that ATAA files will be transmitted the same way as the TAA files will be done. IRS will be referring queries from people that think that they are eligible but not being reported by the state for research and correction next spring to USDOL. If USDOL is unable to resolve the issue at their level, they will refer the query to the state where eligibility should be established.

Workshop: UI Modernization Best Practices

Panelists: Cheryl Metcalf, UI Policy and Training, Washington
Tom Wendell, UI Director, Maryland
Scott Nainis, ITSC

The primary focus of the session was to discuss non-monetary fact finding systems for state staff to use and improve non-monetary determination promptness and quality. Two systems were highlighted, one for the state of Washington, and another in Louisiana (presented by Scott Nainis). Both were similar. The primary benefits of the automated systems were that they led staff through fact finding questions on quits, discharges and other UI issues and assisted the claim examiners to document fact finding information used in making determinations. The systems were not "Expert" systems in that they did not actually make the decisions. Staff had to understand non-monetary policies and know what decision to render based on the answers obtained. The system was very good at keeping documentation in a consistent format and easily retrievable for appeals. There were significant issues with the systems, especially for newly hired staff. Staff tended to rely heavily on the systems instead of reading policy handbooks. As a result, determinations were

found based on unsubstantiated policies that varied regionally (at least in the state of Washington). The systems were completely internal to the state and did not change how information was obtained from the claimants or employers during the initial intake and fact-finding. The information was not made available to employers or claimants over the Internet. Nobody on the panel was aware of any state that was openly displaying fact-finding statements to interested parties.

Tom Wendell, Md., sat in for the planned speaker from Florida. Mr. Wendell spoke about Maryland's experience with Internet initial claims and non-monetary fact finding. He focused on the popularity of Internet intake (from claimants). Non-monetary fact-finding was conducted the traditional way. There was one interesting point from Maryland: they strictly enforce penalties from employers who fail to return the Request for Separation information on time. The penalty is \$15 per occurrence and amounts to \$1.5M in penalty revenue per year.

Workshop: Preventing Detecting and Collecting UI Overpayments: Maximize Your Resources

Panelists: Chris Love, UI Director, Utah
Joe Duda, Ohio
Tom Daniel, Collection Supervisor, Alabama
Darlyne Bryant, U.S. DOL

Ms. Bryant opened the session explaining the new GPRA measure on overpayment detection and how it is computed. For 2002 states were to establish 59% of the total overpayments estimated through BAM (with certain exclusions). The national average was 55% - 56%. The 2003 rate has not yet been established.

Chris Love from Utah spent a considerable amount of time explaining a new data mining system being established in Utah. The matches being developed are similar to Ohio's matches except that there are manual steps requiring staff to set parameters for matching and review selected cases. Cases are then assigned out from PC database for further investigation. Ohio appears to be light years ahead in automation.

Joe did his presentation (attached) and received a lot of questions primarily about the new hire crossmatch, standards for civil prosecution and how Ohio was able to achieve such a high overpayment performance.

Mr. Daniel focused solely on collection activity. (He had technical difficulty with his presentation and had no hands-outs.) Alabama takes an aggressive approach on collecting all overpayments, including non-fraud. They seek liens and do attachments whenever possible. Alabama had very good collection successes but didn't have details on numbers because of the presentation problems.

Workshop: Serving Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Claimants

Panelists: Steve Riley, Texas
Rosie Macs, Washington

Mr. Riley and Ms. Macs discussed serving UI claimants with limited English speaking skills and how they feel their states meet recent federal regulations requiring UC services to LEP customers. Both states hire their own Spanish speaking staff and use AT&T translation services for other languages. Ms. Macs explained that she used to use AT&T for Spanish translations and reduced costs by hiring state staff (Note: she did not factor the increased staffing expenses into her estimates - it was unclear if there was a net gain or loss in operating expenses for Washington.) Washington had difficulty recruiting Spanish-speaking applicants with sufficient background in UC. The states did not duplicate determinations or forms in Spanish; however, a marketing campaign was done to advise customers of Spanish-speaking services. Washington did some paid advertising on TV and radio advising the public that LEP customers could be served by calling a special telephone number. That number is included throughout their web site and on all their routine forms. Material printed in Spanish was brought back and shared with our bi-lingual staff in Interstate. Washington or

Texas did not have a special review process to validate that the language in their publications was understandable by all the different Spanish variations and dialects or had their Spanish material reviewed (by legal council) for legal accuracy.

Workshop: UI Integrity and Data Mining
Panelists: Ronald Giachetti, Fraud Supervisor, Washington
Trish Williams, BPC, Virginia
Daphne Byron, ITSC

The topic description for this session was a little bit misleading in that this workshop dealt with detecting and preventing fraud and was nearly identical to the “Preventing Detecting and Collecting UI Overpayments” session in the morning. Discussions went into details about the New Hire directory and benefits of matching it against UI data. The average amounts of overpayment determinations are less for states using the new hire, which illustrates success in early detection and prevention. A lot of states use multi-claimant single address matches to identify locations receiving multiple unemployment claims. Washington is developing a multi-telephone call/single telephone number cross match on its incoming telephone calls. They found one telephone number that made over 1,000 calls to the call centers in less than 3 months. The problem is that the report doesn’t yet show SSN that was called upon. There is no way yet of detecting which claims may be involved. Washington has an internal group of BPC investigators whose job is to “dabble” matching benefit payments against wage files, other databases and state records to detect claims that should be investigated i.e., matches with Social Security and Bureau of Motor Vehicles. Records with discrepancies (name and/or address not the same) are then reviewed to determine if further investigation is needed. Except for Washington’s multi-claim/single telephone number, Ohio has most of these systems either in place or in the planning stages for development. It is recommended Ohio keep in touch with Washington on the telephone number check and implement something similar (post OJI) as soon as Washington finds a method for capturing SSNs either on the AT&T reports or some other method.

Workshop: Dynamics of Trust Fund Solvency
Panelist: Mike Miller, USDOL
Steve Riley, Texas Workforce Commission

Mr. Miller presented a recap of where states were in terms of their trust funds. He reported that six states are borrowing or have borrowed from the federal account as state trust funds have dried up. States whose trust funds have become insolvent include: Texas, North Carolina, New York, Illinois, Minnesota and Missouri. Mr. Miller said he expects another five to six states to see their trust funds go insolvent within the next year or two. Based on the projections he provided Ohio does not appear to be on his list.

Mr. Riley’s discussion was focused on how Texas floated a \$1.4 billion bond issue as an alternative to borrowing from DOL. Texas has authority to float up to \$2 billion in bonds. There are some specific aspects to Texas solvency strategies that make the bond issue attractive, most notably the fact that Texas UI solvency language seeks to recover the deficit within a calendar year. Thus, Texas employers were looking at eradicating a deficit of the magnitude of over \$1 billion! The bond issue allowed Texas to level out tax rates through 2009 and provides for bond debt service on top of normal experience rating. Texas employers have historically insisted on keeping taxes low during good times and understand that doing so prevents them from ever building a trust fund large enough to adequately handle a recessionary economy.

In the day-one plenary session Dr. Roger Tutterow, Kennesaw State University, Economics and Finance Department, spoke about the economy. Dr. Tutterow stated that the tremendous economic times of the 1990’s were quite unprecedented and that it is unrealistic to expect another ten years without an economic downturn. Given that, it is

possible that the Ohio Trust Fund will be significantly more stressed during the next recession because it will not have had sufficient time to replenish as it did during the 90's. At some point we may need to give this some thought and speak of it to the EAC and UCAC.

Workshop: Employer Service Representatives: Changing Roles

Panelist: Pete Isberg, ADP
Martha Edwards, North Carolina Employment Security Commission
Daphne Byron, ITSC

This workshop featured the ITSC raising awareness that interactions between state workforce agencies and third party representatives needs to take a step forward, out of the traditional paper based system used by most states. Daphne talked about some of the options and pointed us towards a paper they wrote entitled "Analysis of Third Party Data Exchange with SESAs." This paper dated to June 2001. It didn't result in much activity.

Mr. Isberg used the ITSC findings as a launch pad to encourage states to begin a dialog with third party administrators and payroll services for the purpose of gaining a greater understanding of each other's needs and to come to grips with establishing some standard exchange platforms everyone can use. There was general agreement that unless someone took a leadership role in this discussion that states and third party representatives would continue to labor in a paper based environment. Rich Hobbie and Rett Hensley both pledged support from their respective organizations (NASWA and USDOL respectively).

Ms. Edwards' presented North Carolina's web based system for handling electronic notices of claim and request for separation information. The system gives interested parties an electronic means to furnish information resulting in faster resolution of claims.

Workshop: Customer Service: How Do We Measure It?

Panelist: Sandra Damesworth, Michigan Bureau of Workers Compensation and Unemployment Compensation
Chris Peretto, Michigan Bureau of Workers Compensation and Unemployment Compensation
Roger Holmes, Idaho Department of Labor

Each presenter talked about the various survey instruments they used to measure specific aspects of their business operations. Idaho uses an online survey for claimants using the Internet for claims filing, and may require Internet or telephone claims filing. Idaho used experts from Idaho State University to assist them in determining what questions to ask and how to ask them on the survey. Mr. Holmes urged states to seek expert help when devising such instruments.

Michigan surveyed customers who had been audited, they surveyed about their Advocacy program and surveyed employers and claimants regarding their benefit program. Nothing really remarkable was found in any of these surveys. Michigan has used the results to tweak their program and has followed their performance through a change of administration that saw a substantial reduction in force. They were somewhat surprised at how well they maintained services considering the upheaval they have experienced in the recent past.

A question regarding if they were ready to make the move towards putting a survey out that went more towards specific performance in classic tax functions like we do with our customers with respect to new business determinations, address changes and refunds. Chris thought the concept was interesting and took note of it.

Workshop: State Unemployment Tax Act (SUTA) Dumping

Panelist: Fred Gamin, North Carolina Employment Security Commission

Steve Riley, Texas Workforce Commission
Robert A. Cottrell, Jr., North Carolina Employment Security Commission
Jerry Hildebrand, USDOL

This was the best workshop of the four and by far the best attended. Basically, each speaker pushed to ensure everyone understood that SUTA dumping is happening in every state and that it is our duty as tax practitioners to take steps to curb the practice. We in Ohio already have fundamental guards against the practice but clearly we need to bolster our law. The conventional wisdom seems to indicate that laws are needed that make the practice illegal and provides penalties to the parties involved. As it stands now, SUTA dumping is facilitated via loopholes in state laws. We probably need to consider what constitutes a transfer of experience rating and we need to have the ability to force a successorship in terms of partial transfers where we determine that the sole purpose for the transfer is to dump an experience rate.

We also need to build detection methodologies that are easy to use so that we can find the folks involved in SUTA dumping practices and as one presenter stressed, we need to enforce the statutes once enacted.

In the day one plenary session Mike Durik, Vice President of Human Resources, Kelly Services, spoke on the topic. Kelly Services has a corporate policy against the practice and is working to get states to take action. As an employer averaging about 100-150k, employees every 1/10 of one percent changes in experience results in millions of dollars in expenses. He is urging all states to get on board to defeat this practice and is willing to speak to policy makers, legislators etc, to ensure understanding.

Workshop: Current and Emerging Federal Issues in UI
Panelist: Brock Timmons, Georgia Department of Labor, UI Tax
Carol Brassey, Idaho Department of Labor
Jerry Hildebrand, US DOL, DC

Jerry Hildebrand addressed 1) an assessment of what Congress is interested in, 2) SUTA dumping, 3) Baby UI regulations, and 4) how states are using Reed Act funds and how this is perceived by Congress.

The leadership in Congress views UI as a disincentive to employment and is interested in identifying methods to improve collection of overpayments. There is also interest in further expansion of HCTC credit to all UI eligibles and generally to find alternative ways to support unemployed workers in ways other than “traditional” unemployment benefit payments. The PRA initiative is still alive and could emerge during appropriation bill negotiations. The TEUC-A program did not cover many workers and will probably not be extended, however, it is likely that the regular TEUC program will be extended in some way into 2004.

There is considerable buzz on Capitol Hill about how the states do not need additional money in light of the Reed Act distribution. It is difficult to explain that this money is state money and not federal money.

USDOL is repealing the Baby UI regulations effective in November. The interpretation of federal law will return to the interpretation prior to the Baby UI pilot and require that an individual be able and available for suitable work.

The SUTA dumping legislation continues to be the topic of conversation with Congressman Wally Herger and there is concern from some employers and states that there is widespread abuse of SUTA dumping to avoid experience rated tax increases. There was discussion of the relationship between FUTA and SUTA and that state agencies have difficulty at times explaining that one tax is experience rated and the other is not. Per Jerry, a bill has been introduced by Congressmen Portman and Cardin to recognize PEOs for the purposes of FUTA.

Access to the National New Hire database continues to be included in the TANF Reauthorization bill, but it is not likely to move until next spring.

Workshop: Reemployment of UI Claimants

Panelist: Ray Filippone, Rhode island Department of Labor & Training
Christopher O'Leary, WE Upjohn Institute, Kalamazoo, MI
Grace Kilbane, US DOL, DC
Rosemarie Lemoin, Rhode Island Department of Labor & Training

The Rhode Island pilot project was described in some detail. The pilot was funded by taking 0.3% of the UI tax over three years and using these funds to provide reemployment services to UI claimants along with Wagner Peyser, WIA and Trade funding in an effort to reduce duration of UI benefits.

The pilot featured one on one case management with access to LMI information. Claimants were required to report weekly on the RI jobs network and to be available for interviews and sessions under the case management plan. If they failed to report their benefits were held up.

In the project all UI claimants were included. The average duration of those provided case management compared to similar groups not in pilot offices dropped from 17.9 weeks to 15.7 weeks.

Participating claimants who entered employment had an average duration of 14.3 weeks compared to 17.9 weeks.

The exhaustion rate for participants was 29% compared to 55% for the comparable group.

Estimated savings from the pilot in 2002 in benefit payout was \$767,000.

A key to success was having staff devoting most of their time to the project.

Grace Kilbane described the USDOL "No Worker Left Behind" initiative. The initiative seeks to connect remote claims services with one-stops and moving to a demand driven system that targets locally in light of workforce factors.

Grace pointed out that one-stop operating systems needed real time LMI information and skills information to be successful. UI is viewed as the "front door" to the one-stop system. USDOL believes that UI folks should own reemployment services as much as the one-stops do. Data systems should be coordinated using web based applications. Guidelines describing services to be available include GAL 5-77 and WPRS manuals.

Grace reviewed typical reemployment services, kinds of activities being used in reemployment services grants, significant improvement demonstration grants to improve WPRS Reemployment Services, major activities, and impacts on the economy.

USDOL is developing a measurement of the entered employment rate of all UI claimants to be pilot tested in six states. The new measure will be implemented in FY 2004. Wages will be used as a proxy for employment.

Chris O'Leary of the Upjohn Institute reported on the NASWA survey of job search rules and employment effects in the states. The report found that:

- Required job search shortens duration.
- Automation of claims and policy has relaxed UI job search requirements.
- WPRS works and should be kept up to date and linked to services.

- ERP works and should be used by more states.
- New ways to link UI claimants to reemployment services should be tried.

Workshop: Confidential Data: Putting it to work and keeping it secure

Panelist: Tom Valasak, Idaho Department of Labor
John Sharkey, US DOL, DC
Amanda Gohl, Lockheed Martin, Orlando, FL
Maria Colavito, NASWA, Albany, NY

Maria Colavito provided an update of the status of WRIS and described the confidentiality review process that was implemented by NASWA to assure confidentiality.

Dale Zeigler provided an update on the SSA on-line data exchange project that has been funded in 36 states, including IV and V security certification. The project is scheduled for implementation in November 2003. Dale also summarized the identity verification project. USDOL is facilitating the evaluation of the LexisNexis matching process by three states to help identify incorrect or fraudulent SSNs.

John Sharkey summarized the status of OIG security audits of state UI benefit and tax systems. The OIG conducted IT Security audits in California, Maryland, North Carolina and Michigan in FY 2003. They will conduct four more audits in FY 2004 in Florida, Missouri, Washington and ICON.

Amanda Gohl of Lockheed Martin reviewed the UI ICON Network application and data integrity procedures.

Workshop: Open Issues Forum

Panelist: Rich Running, Iowa Workforce Development
Jeffrey Wells, Colorado Department of Labor & Employment
Dale Ziegler, US DOL, DC
Pete Fleming, US DOL, Regional Office, Atlanta, GE

The workshop was relatively short with no presentation. It was suggested to the panel that if there was going to be a common measure for UC Reemployment Services that there should be some common definition of reemployment services rendered across employment and training systems. Otherwise it will not be possible to draw cause and effect relationships to entered employment rate changes over time. Chris O'Leary of Upjohn agreed with the suggestion and the panel wrote it down.