* 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