* Jim – background for unprecedented challenges internally and externally
  + Internal
    - Sudden telework lacking full automation
    - Social distancing for mandatory in-house functions
    - Diminished workforce, including furloughs and temporary reassignment
    - Health concerns for employees
    - Struggle when program is administered at county level and counties vary significantly in their operational status, even within same county
  + External
    - Highly elevated need for funds for recipients and payors
    - Courts are closed
    - Customers could not direct access – suspension of genetic tests
* Liesa - responsiveness – we go long stretches without getting a substantive status update.  Even after asking for such, we didn’t get any for another two weeks.
  + Need more frequent communication from Central at a substantive level, and not comparatively trivial matters or meetings that can be delayed
  + Guidance on offsets after they occurred is not helpful
  + Stafford Act waivers six weeks later have diminished effectiveness
* Kristie – compare clearance process for other HHS programs – where are the bottlenecks?
  + What happened to streamlining and simplifying processes?
* Lyndsy and Kate – legal and policy inflexibility – OCSE forcing minority views on states
  + FMAP Q&A is latest example – better interpretation of law was to rely on FMAP at beginning of FFY
  + Are policy and legal conclusions challenged internally when contrary to state flexibility?
    - OCSE disregarded state argument on flexibility for submitting obligors for offset
  + Engage in problem-solving with directors without self-imposed limitations of clearance process or paperwork reduction act
  + Some questions better not answered at all, and would be good to have collaboration and opportunity to withdraw
* Carla - Economic Impact Payments and IRS reversals
  + Coded the same as tax refunds – required, or merely convenient for IRS?
  + Errors in file – when will those be cleaned up?  Why does it take so long?
  + IRS reversal process for erroneous payments is unique when payment was offset and is both bad policy and a huge liability for states
  + When are we going to learn whether IRS intends to seek reversals of impact payments to deceased or incarcerated obligors?  Does OCSE recognize the potential magnitude of this liability?
  + Risks of IRS reversals, and amount of money currently held up that needs to go back to struggling payors or families who need the support

Moving Forward

* Chad - Approve waivers on a proactive categorical level
* Jeremy and Michele – heightened paternity penalty concerns, especially in 2021
* Future pressures on program – funding for program, increased referrals from other programs, lower employment levels among parents who owe support
* Jim and all – better leadership
  + Partnership means more than saying “we hear you,” and then the input makes no impact on final outcome
  + Need full-time commissioner
  + Recognize realistic chances of obtaining changes in federal law before giving up on regulatory interpretations for flexibility
  + Creative and courageous – states have stopped looking to OCSE for leadership
    - lack confidence that OCSE leadership is willing to take new interpretation on old practices (policy inflexibility)
    - FAQs was missed opportunity to express how OCSE planned to approach potential plan noncompliance due to pandemic with lenience