The second round of Vendor Questions and Answers has been posted to the SACWIS RFP page of the DHR website (www.dhr.state.al.us). Extensive supporting documentation has also been added to the SACWIS Procurement Library.

The Q&A process resulted in a few modifications to the RFP and associated appendices. These modifications will be posted to the DHR website in the near future as an addendum to the RFP. All of the modifications to be included in the addendum have already been addressed in the State's answers to vendor questions in either Round 1 or Round 2 of the Q&A process. We look forward to receiving vendor proposals on April 14, 2006. Thank you.

Starr Stewart

SACWIS RFP Questions and Answers – Round 2

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
01.	Section 1.4	Will the Proposal Attendee List be distributed?	The Bid Conference attendee list has been posted to the web site. Attendees should review the information and send any corrections to the Procurement Officer.
02.	Section 1.5.4	What Project Mgmt methodologies does the State adhere to, i.e. PMBOK, CMM, PMI, etc.	The State is asking vendors to propose a project management methodology that is consistent with industry standards.
03.	Section 1.5.4	Page 13, Given that a CMMI assessment is made for a particular entity such as a project or development center, please confirm that the Department will accept the submission of a self assessment or formal CMMI assessment for the project established in Alabama to meet the mandated requirement?	The State will accept a project-based assessment.
04.	Section 1.5.8	When do you expect to release the IV&V RFP?	We anticipate a release in mid May 2006.
05.	Section 1.5.8	When the IV&V RFP is released, will their be a Bidders Conference?	This decision has not yet been made.
06.	Section 3.4.3	We understand the vendor is responsible for maintaining a separate technical environment as specified in section 3.4.3. Will the vendor be allowed to utilize the OS/390 DB2 mainframe development region to create multiple schemas supporting development, conversion, testing, and training? If so, are there any constraints such as the number of schemas allowed, MIPS allocation and storage capacity?	The Vendor is responsible for maintaining a separate technical environment during the development and testing phases of the project. The State's mainframe should not be considered to be available for these tasks. The system will be migrated to the State's test environment at the appropriate time during the testing process.
07.	Section 3.12	Page 32 states, "The functionality of the QSR database has been set out in the functional requirements attached as Appendix E and will be subsumed in the new SACWIS system." Question: Please clarify or site specific system requirements that are expected to meet the QSR function as described in Section 3.12.	The Quality Service Review (QSR) database was established for Quality Assurance (QA) staff to document QSR ratings, which are one component of on-site reviews. Please refer to the SACWIS RFP Procurement Library for the Alabama QSR Profile that displays the information gathered during a QSR review. QA staff use the information documented in the QSR database as one method to help determine the level of progress the counties are making in meeting a number of the safety, permanency and well-being indicators, along with indicators related to several systemic issues.
08.	Section 3.16.1	Will the existing Test, QA, and Training web/application environments be running the current ASSIST application simultaneously with the new ASSIST application—that is, will the environments be shared between both efforts?	No.
09.	Section 3.16.1	Does the State currently use an ad hoc data reporting tool for preparing output reports from ASSIST? If so, what is it?	The State does not currently have an ad hoc data reporting tool that is utilized by ASSIST. The State has recently selected Cognos Impromptu as its preferred tool and all ad hoc applications will be conducted using this tool.

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
10.	Section 3.16.1	Does Alabama DHR currently have a data warehouse? If so, what are the technical specifications of the data warehouse?	DHR does not currently have a data warehouse.
11.	Section 3.16.1	Does Alabama require that authentication security be managed through use of an industry standard security package such as Tivoli Identity Manager?	The State currently employs IBM's RACF (Resource Access Control Facility) as its authentication manager for the mainframe and Microsoft Active Directory as its authentication manager to the State's WAN/LAN.
12.	Section 3.16.1	One of the activities of Task 3.3 is to "Identify and aid State in identifying potential network performance issues." We assume that the intent is for the vendor to aid the State with network performance issues related to the operation of the ASSIST system, and not all DHR or Alabama network performance issues. Is this assumption correct?	The assumption is correct.
13.	Section 3.16.1	What are the hardware specifications for the servers that currently support the middle tier of the ASSIST application (for example, web server, Enterprise Application Server, load balancers)? We found some information in the procurement library, but would like the State to please fill out the missing items. Specifically, what are the following specifications? (see example detail provided): **Example** Quantity: 2 Model: Dell PowerEdge 6850 Processor: 3.16 GHz/ 1 MB Cache, Xeon Quad Processor Memory: 8 GB Disk: 2 x 36 GB SCSI – Embedded RAID 5 NIC: Dual On-Board NICS OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Development Environment: Web/Application Server Quantity: 1 Model: ? Processor: ? (single processor – need more detail) Memory: ? Disk: ? NIC: ? OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Test/QA Environment: Web/Application Server (currently shared with Training) Quantity: 1 Model: ? Processor: ? (dual processor – need more detail) Memory: ? Disk: ? NIC: ? OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Training Environment: Web/Application Server Quantity: 1 Model: ? Processor: ? (dual processor – need more detail) Memory: ?	Development Environment: Web/Application Server Quantity: 1 Model: Dell PowerEdge 2500 Processor: Single x86 Family 6 Model 11 Stepping 1 Memory: 1 GB Disk: 2 drives in a raid (C:4GB, D:30GB) NIC: Intel 8255x-based PCI Ethernet Adapter (10/100) OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Training and Test/QA Environment: Web/Application Server (currently shared with Training) Quantity: 1 Model: Dell PowerEdge 2550 Processor: Dual –x86 Family 6 Model 11 Stepping 1, GenuineIntel Memory: 2 GB Disk: 3 drives in a raid (C:4GB, D:30GB) NIC: Intel 9255x-based PCI Ethernet Adapter (10/100) OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Training Environment see above: Forms/Correspondence Environment: Web/Application Server Quantity: 1 Model: Dell PowerEdge 2550 Processor: Dual – x86 Family 6 Model 11 Stepping 1, GenuineIntel Memory: 2 GB Disk: 3 drives in a raid (C:4GB, D:30GB) NIC: Intel 8255x-based PCI Ethernet Adapter (10/100) OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Production Environment: IP load balancing – done the DNS round robin, caching – static cache, SSL Acceleration – not currently utilized (application is all intranet) (Please describe any hardware devices) Web/Application Server

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
		Disk: ? NIC: ? OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Forms/Correspondence Environment: Web/Application Server Quantity: 1 Model: ? Processor: ? (dual processor – need more detail) Memory: ? Disk: ? NIC: ? OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT Production Environment: IP load balancing, caching, SSL Acceleration (Please describe any hardware devices) Web/Application Server Quantity: 2 Model: ? Processor: ? (dual processor, accessed via a DNS round-robin – need more detail) Memory: ? Disk: ? NIC: ? OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT New Server: Web/Application Server Quantity: 1 Model: ? Processor: ? (quad processor – need more detail) Memory: ? Disk: ? NIC: ? OS: EAServer 5.1.0 on Windows 2003	Quantity: 2 Model: Dell Power Edge 2550 Processor: Dual-x86 Family 6 Model 11 Stepping 1, GenuineIntel (accessed via a DNS round-robin. Application servers (EAServer) split the load on the processors). Memory: 2GB Disk: 3 drives in a raid (C:4GB, D:30GB) NIC: Intel 8255x-based PCI Ethernet Adapter (10/100) OS: EAServer 4.2.5 on Windows NT New Server: Web/Application Server Quantity: 1 Model: Dell PowerEdge 6850 Processor: Quad processor, 80546K, 3.0G, 8MB, XEON POTOMAC, 667 Memory: 4 GB Disk: 3 drives in a raid (C:12GB, D:124GB) NIC: Broadcom Netextreme Gigabit Ethernet OS: EAServer 5.1.0 on Windows 2003
14.	Section 4	Can vendors propose project deliverables in a different order that prescribed by the RFP? An example would be on Page 53, Task 4.1 Prepare Development Environment and Task 4.2 Implement Development Standards and Process where these tasks would be completed earlier to support the requirements determination and joint application design sessions (JAD).	The State is open to project plans that call for concurrent work on tasks and their associated deliverables that are not related.
15.	Section 4, Task 1	Page 45 and 46. Please provide the State preferred software with version numbers that should be used to create and support project management tasks. Additionally, please provide the version of Microsoft Office Suite products that the State currently uses to ensure that the vendor response is submitted that is accessible and readable by the State.	The State currently uses Microsoft Project 98 and Microsoft Office 97. The State plans to upgrade to Microsoft Project 2003 Enterprise Edition and to Microsoft Office 2003 Professional Edition in the next 6 – 12 months.
16.	Section 4, Task 5	Is the State preparing to dedicate full time resources to the data conversion effort? If so, what is the skill set breakdown of each resource (for example, two technical subject matter experts and one functional subject matter expert for each legacy system)?	Yes. The State has a conversion team that will be dedicated full time to the data conversion effort. The team is comprised of four technical subject matter experts and sufficient functional subject matter experts for all legacy systems. The State also plans to utilize the technical and functional resources of the existing project teams for each legacy system on an as-needed basis.

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
17.	Section 4, Task 5	Does the State want to reconcile converted financial data using legacy reports or will the reconciliation be directly against the legacy databases?	The State has no preference as to how the Vendor will reconcile converted financial data, so long as the reconciliation is completed timely, efficiently and accurately.
18.	Section 4, Task 5	Does the State expect to link data during the conversion that is not linked in the legacy systems (for example, merge person information from one system to another)?	Yes.
19.	Section 4, Task 5	Are the layouts of archived or historical data the same as the active systems?	Yes.
20.	Section 4, Task 5	Page 56 states, "Because of the lack of State resources and time, the State is asking the Vendor to convert size of the larger systems while the State will convert the smaller eight systems". Question: Please confirm that the State will complete all system development tasks related to the eight systems that the State is responsible to convert, including requirements, design, development, test, deployment and integration into the overall conversion approach.	The State will complete all system development tasks related to the eight systems that the State is responsible for converting.
21.	Section 4, Task 5	Page 56, Please define any State preference for Extraction, Transformation, and Loading (ETL) tools that should be considered in the conversion strategy. Due to the Vendor's dependence on the State to complete conversion tasks related to the eight systems for conversion, the overall approach must factor in the skill set of the State resources and any State ETL toolset preferences.	The State currently has no tools for Extraction, Transformation and Loading (ETL). Because the eight systems that the State is converting are small in scope, the State does not believe ETL tools are necessary for this task.
22.	Section 4, Task 5.3	Does the State expect the vendor to extract the legacy data directly from the legacy systems or can the State's technical staffs "dump" the legacy database tables into ASCII delimited text files?	The Vendor must extract the data directly from the six systems identified in RFP Section 3.15 as systems to be converted by the Vendor. Per Section 4, Task 5.3 of the RFP, the State requires the Vendor to design, develop and test conversion programs for the six systems as indicated above. The State will extract the data directly from the other eight legacy systems the State is responsible for.
23.	Section 4, Task 5.3	Page 58 states, "The Vendor will create the programs to extract the data from the six legacy systems for conversion into the new ASSIST system. Please clarify who is responsible to extract the data from the eight systems that the State is responsible for.	The State will be responsible for extracting the data from these eight systems. The Vendor will have input regarding the overall conversion approach.
24.	Section 4, Task 5.4	Please clarify if the SACWIS Vendor is only responsible for systems development life cycle tasks for the outgoing and incoming files into the new ASSIST system and the partnering systems is responsible for the systems development life cycle tasks for the outgoing and incoming files in their system.	Please see response to question 28 in Vendor Q&A, Round 1.
25.	Section 4, Task 6.4	Page 69 states, "The State and the ASSIST Quality Assurance Vendor will review the Implementation Vendor's Task 6.4 deliverables. Once the Pre-Acceptance tests are approved by the State and the QA Vendor, the State-led Acceptance Testing will begin." Question: Please confirm that this is the only identified "go-no go" point driven by acceptance of a project deliverable. Is it acceptable for vendors to respond with a systems development lifecycle approach that is iterative in nature and not structured on tasks beginning until deliverable(s) are accepted and a "go" decision is provided by the State to move to the next task?	The deliverable referenced in this question is not the only "go-no go" point driven by acceptance of a project deliverable. Please refer to Section 4, pages 44 and 45 of the RFP for a complete list of the "go-no go" decision points. Section 4 states "The Vendor may propose a project approach that is based on different tasks so long as the underlying activities are completed and required deliverables are produced." Vendors are free to propose alternate approaches, but the State reserves the right to approve alternative approaches to ensure that no tasks are begun until any logical pre-requisites are completed and approved by the State.
26.	Section 4, Task 7.3	Page 72 states, "The Vendor will be responsible for training delivery along with training State staff to assume ongoing training and end user support functions." Question: Please clarify how many State staff the Vendor is required to train.	The number of individuals to be trained is approximately 2,100 (Please see response to question 3 in Vendor Q&A, Round 1). The number of State trainers to be trained will not exceed ten.

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
27.	Section 4, Task 7.3	Page 73, 2nd Paragraph, Please confirm the State's preference if Vendor procured training facilities will be allowed to enter into the project training region via the State WAN.	If needed, access to the training region through the State WAN will be provided. The State will be responsible for making the necessary arrangements.
28.	Section 4, Task 7.3	Page 73, 2nd Paragraph, Please state the number of miles that are not to be exceeded for State staff to travel to training facilities. Additionally, is it the State's expectation to reimburse staff for traveling expenses?	There is no set policy limiting the number of miles staff can travel to attend training. However, the State expects that the Vendor's Training Plan, which is subject to State approval, will make geographic sense, will make the best use of trainees' time, and will limit the need for overnight stays as much as possible. The State will reimburse trainees for traveling expenses.
29.	Section 4, Task 8.1, 8.5	As the vendor plans the participation of both vendor and state staff for pilot and rollout, can you describe current plans on the part of the state for local superusers or other designated staff of the Department who will play a mentoring or assistance role in the local offices?	Each county has at least one person designated as the County ASSIST Mentor (super-user). Larger counties have more than one. A Mentor is a person designated by the County Director to act as the county office's point of contact regarding ASSIST issues. The Mentor receives additional ASSIST training and has a higher level of understanding of the system than other users. It is the State's intention to use Mentors to provide on site expertise during the training, implementation and rollout of the new system. Further, some ASSIST staff, as well as State Trainers, will be available for additional on-site support during implementation. Please refer to the Procurement Library, Miscellaneous, Staff Training Overview for the breakout of the number of Mentors by county.
30.	Section 4, Task 8.3	Regarding the Help Desk, can the Help Desk be located outside the State during the Pilot and warranty period?	Please see response to question 36 in Vendor Q&A, Round 1.
31.	Section 4, Task 9.2	Page 5 of 7 from the State Cultural Change Management Plan provided in the documentation library states, "Establish a detailed plan to provide on-site support during and immediately following implementation." Question: Please clarify if the on-site support activities and resources are the sole responsible of the State, or if the State expects the Vendor to provide the resources to execute the activities as planned by the State.	The State will provide the on-site support activities to implement and support the Cultural Change Management Plan.
32.	Section 4, Task 9.2	Page 80, 1st Paragraph in section states, "This is to insure continuity in the operation of the system and to provide an adequate period of time for State staff to be trained to take over full responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the system." Question: Please clarify if it is the State's expectation that the Vendor is responsible for toolset training that may be required for State staff to have the adequate knowledge and skill set to maintain the system.	The State will provide its staff with basic toolset training for any tools required to maintain the system. The Vendor must, as a part of its Knowledge Transfer Plan, administer sufficient on-the-job training on these toolsets to provide context to State staff and prepare them to maintain the system at the conclusion of the contract period.
33.	Section 4, Task 9.4	Please clarify the State's expectations of the Vendor given that the SACWIS Assessment process normally takes several years from initial meetings to final federal closure. How does the State expect the Vendor to complete tasks identified after the contract period has ended?	It is the State's intent that the Vendor assist the State in preparing for the formal SACWIS compliance review through activities such as preparing the SACWIS review guide, gathering documentation and providing the State with pertinent technical information in advance of the review. We believe that these activities can be completed prior to the expiration of the warranty period.
34.	Section 4, Task 9.4	Please clarify that the Vendor is not responsible for non-compliant SACWIS Assessment requirements that are not system related. Often, State's are cited to review and correct business challenges that drive the system design.	The Vendor is not expected to address business processes that may drive system requirements and design.
35.	Section 5.1.2.2	Our firm currently does business with the State, what disclosures must we make as part of this process?	See Section 5.1.2.2 of the RFP and the section entitled "Registration with Purchasing Division" on page 5 of Appendix A, Standard Terms and Conditions.

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
36.	Section 5.1.4	Page 84, Bullet C - Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) - For the "Full/Partial" requirement description, please clarify the State's meaning of "Full - "little or no" modification required, versus "Partial". Clarification of the definition is required to ensure that the evaluation measures are the same for all vendors. For example, does "little or no" modification mean a drop down value change, business rule change, alert definition change, etc.	Vendors should mark a requirement "Full" in the RTM if the functionality is in the base system and can be implemented in Alabama with "little to no modification". In this context, "little to no modification" means that whatever changes are required are cosmetic in nature and do not materially alter the integrity, structure, or core functionality of the module. The following are examples of modifications that fall within the "little to no modification" category: Reference value changes, changes in the number of days for alerts to appear, changes in wording of alerts, other minor formatting changes to fit Alabama-specific needs.
37.	Section 5.1.4.4	Page 88, 5th Bullet states, "Support needed from State staff in terms of people, hours, and skill sets for each task, including deliverable review needs." Please clarify if the work plan should be staffed with the State staffing plan as defined in Appendix L - Project Organization of the documentation library, or if the State is requesting the Vendor to propose what State staff is needed to adequately perform the task.	The Vendor is being asked to propose what they believe is the appropriate level of State resources and skills to perform the specified tasks. This is for the State's information only and the Vendor should not assume that specifying a resource level in its proposal binds the State to that level. The State is ultimately responsible for determining and providing the appropriate level of resources in order to meet its responsibilities under the contract.
38.	Section 6.0	Page 89, Section 6.0 Holdbacks and Pricing Information defines the 10% holdback, 5% to be paid upon completion of the statewide implementation and the remaining 5% to be paid upon the completion of the one year warranty agreement. Please clarify if the State will pay all outstanding holdback amounts if the contract is terminated for State reasons.	The procedures to be followed in the event of contract termination will be addressed during contract negotiations. If the contract is terminated at the convenience of the State, negotiations are normally conducted at that time regarding termination claims. Any pending holdbacks would be part of that negotiation.
39.	Section 6.2	The RFP states that the Vendor is to list additional hardware and software required to implement the State's solution. What is the current capacity of the State's infrastructure including hardware, software, storage and peripherals? How much of that capacity can be considered available for ASSIST? How many licenses are available for DB2 on the mainframe?	Please refer to Section 3.16 of the RFP for an overview of the State's technical environment. WAN links- T1 frame relay connection to Montgomery from the county offices. The WAN links are configured in a hub-and-spoke setup with all counties and remote offices being one hop away from the central Montgomery office. Network switches/hubs- Cisco 3550 10/100 switches and Synoptic 10 mps hubs. About 70% of the desktops are on the Cisco switches (55% of the sites), with the remainder being shared on 10mbps hubs. Infrastructure servers, numbers of servers, and rough specs- The DHR network will be a Microsoft Server 2003 based system. Each county will have a Dell 1800 server for file and print, domain controller and software distribution. The servers will come with 215GB of disk space, though a significant percentage of that will be used already. There will be 12 back office servers functioning as Domain controllers, SMS servers, etc. These will be Dell 2850's with dual Xeon processors, varying amounts of disk space and RAM. Peripherals – Each site has network black and white printers available, as well as desktop black and white laser printers. The numbers vary depending on the number of users at the site. DB2 licenses on the mainframe are unlimited for State users. The State believes that the infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate a SACWIS solution.
40.	Appendix E, Requirement # 43	Please clarify the State expectation regarding the "unmerging" functionality.	The State's expectation is that the undo merge (unmerging) will revert the retained person and the merged person back to their status as of the "Date Merged". Undo case merge involves de-linking one or more pieces of work such

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
			as assessments, investigations, Individual Service Plans, etc., from the incorrect case and linking to the correct case.
41.	Appendix E, Requirement #74	Requirement 74 requires that the Vendor solution 'encrypt PHI on the database and during data transmission'. Is the State currently using an encryption product to encrypt PHI data during data transmission? If so, could the State please provide the name of the product used and the vendor?	The State does not currently have encryption deployed. Procurement of an encryption package through the State bid process is planned in the near future. Encrypted material will include data in transit on the State WAN and the campus LAN. It will not cover data in transit on an agency LAN or at rest on a server. The encryption that will be used is a Cisco hardware, IPsec based solution.
42.	Appendix E, Requirement # 90	Does the State have a defined case weighting methodology that is expected to be automated, or can this requirement be defined by the current vendor solution?	The State's case weighting methodology is described below. Caseload standards per worker have been established for workloads of 100% as follows: • 18 foster care • 22 adoptions • 18 family protective service • 40 resources cases • 12 prevention cases • 12 regular CA/N* • 8 sexual abuse CA/N* • 10 foster care CA/N* *Note: A county specific formula is used to determine how many of the total CA/N cases received in a county should be designated as regular, sexual abuse or foster care.
43.	Appendix E, Requirement #171	Requirement 171 calls for a method of generating random case samples for the Federal Government. Is the State currently providing random case samples to meet Federal requirements? If so, could the State please describe the software and processes used.	The State does not generate random case samples to meet Federal requirements. Rather, the State generates the appropriate case universes to the Federal agency from which they select a random sample. Requirement # 171 will be amended to say, "The system must generate appropriate case universes for random sampling."
44.	Appendix E, Requirement # 176	What is the scope of the "ad-hoc" reporting capability? Is it the full replicated production data, or a pre-defined set of management statistical reports with drill down features? Please provide the State's preferred approach and the scope of expected data.	The State does not envision a need for a fully replicated copy of the production database for ad hoc reporting. At a later point in the project, a predefined set of management statistical reports will be defined which will serve as the basis for the data that must be available for ad hoc reporting. The ad hoc reporting solution must provide drill-down features to authorized users.
45.	Appendix E, Requirement #176	At the Pre-Proposal Conference there was a presentation that stated "Cognos Impromptu will be the State's ad hoc package" and "State requires a robust ad hoc reporting solution as a part of vendor proposals". Can you please elaborate on the current usage of Cognos Impromptu at DHR? Is there an architecture already in place for Cognos Impromptu that will allow it scale to the number of users necessary for the new SACWIS system? Does this statement mean that vendors will need to included costs for licenses of Cognos Impromptu for every user needing ad hoc capability or has DHR already purchased enough seat licenses of Cognos Impromptu for users that will need it? Are there any batch or standard reports that have been created using Cognos Impromptu that can be leveraged for the new SACWIS system? Lastly, if a vendor would like to propose a different reporting solution for delivering standard reports to end users over the web, or will this be looked upon unfavorably?	The State has only recently selected Cognos Impromptu as its standard ad hoc reporting tool. Thus, no reports have been produced using the tool for the Vendor to leverage. The architecture should be in place prior to the project start date that will allow ASSIST users to utilize Impromptu. The State has purchased sufficient licenses for all users. The State does not expect Impromptu to be used to generate all reports. Standardized reports that are generated regularly are expected to be batch reports rather than ad hoc reports. As such, unlike ad hoc reports, the approach to producing these batch reports is not restricted to approaches incorporating Impromptu.
46.	Appendix E, Requirement # 509	Please clarify that is it is the State's expectation that IV-E initial eligibility and redetermination be completed in the SACWIS system, and not redeterminations for eligibility for the following eligibility types: Medicaid (Title XIX), EA, WRTI, Title XX, and TANF. Please clarify how the requirement is currently	It is the State's expectation that IV-E initial eligibility determinations and eligibility re-determinations are to be automated in the SACWIS system. Initial eligibility determinations and eligibility re-determination for Medicaid, EA, WRTI, and Title XX are also to be automated in the SACWIS system. (For the

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
		written.	purposes of this requirement, TANF does not refer to TANF benefit eligibility, but as TANF relates to the determination of IV-E eligibility).
47.	Appendix E, Requirement # 559	Please clarify the State's expectation of the system ability to process retroactive eligibility claims. Does the State expect all processing to be automated, through the use of reports, or a combination of both to support the State completion of the Title IV-E Quarterly Claim?	It is the State's expectation that the system will support the State's completion of the Title IV-E Quarterly Claim through a combination of both automation and reports. The DHR Finance Division will continue to file the Quarterly Claim.