

**September 30, 2009  
MeF Webinar**

The Chairperson opened the webinar with roll call in order to conduct a voice vote on several outstanding MeF issues; the following states and industry were present on the call:

Arizona	Alabama
Arkansas	California – FTB
Colorado	Connecticut
Delaware	Georgia
Idaho	Illinois
Indiana	Iowa
Louisiana	Maryland
Michigan	Minnesota
Mississippi	Missouri
Montana	Montana
Nebraska	New Jersey
New Mexico	New York City
North Carolina	North Dakota
Oklahoma	Oregon
Pennsylvania	Rhode Island
South Carolina	Tennessee
Utah	Vermont
Virginia	West Virginia
Wisconsin	

Intuit, H and R Block, TTI, CCH, and Petz Enterprises

IRS

**AGENDA – TIGERS WEBINAR  
SEPTEMBER 30, 2009**

**IRS Update**

- **1040 Working Group Presentation**
  - **Status Updates**
  - **Fed/State**
  - **ATS**
  - **Form Updates**
  - **Publication Updates**
  - **IRS.gov Updates**

**FinancialTransaction for IAT**

- **Review and Approve Draft Schema**
- **Rules on Restricting IAT**

## **IRSForms Folder**

- **Plan to Provide Schemas**

### **SubmissionCategory in State Manifest**

After roll call Terry reviewed the agenda. Greg Martinez (Co-Chairman) requested that we add, to the agenda, review the submission category in the state manifest.

The meeting was then turned over to Juanita Wueller, from the IRS to provide the IRS update and working group follow-up. Below is a high level summary of Juantia's presentation; the entire presentation is available on [statemef.com](http://statemef.com):

- Volume Management Progress – Xan was unable to attend the meeting however, until the testing is completed, which will occur around the end of October, and official plan cannot be published. The details of the management plan will be distributed via the TIGERS listsrv shortly.
- New WSDLs and transmission and system requirements will be published in the 1040 working group meeting minutes which are due out shortly.
- 1040 MeF ATS begins November 2, 2009.
- 1040 MeF Production begins February 17, 2010.
- No changes, at this time, to Phase 2 and 3.
- ETA Industry Call scheduled for September 29, 2009
- Next 1040 working group conference call is second last Monday in October.

#### Financial Transaction and IAT issues:

Terry Garber explained that as a result of communications with Pricilla of NACHA it will not be necessary to develop the IAT data elements to accommodate foreign bank information in the FT IAT record since the accepting bank will be responsible for providing the foreign bank information.

Terry requested feedback as to whether or not the State payment/refund should allow states to restrict out the IAT portion of the FT schema if they do not support the IAT?

- There was no objection from state or industry to allowing states to restrict (remove the elements) the IAT structure in the FT schema.
- It was noted that by including the Jurat in the schema, it would help to support that a state has performed their due diligence for IATs.

After lengthy discussion about the proposed amended structure, a voice vote was taken to accept the IAT structure with the ReceivingDFName as an attribute rather than an optional element in the FT schema. All states present accepted the amended structure except Illinois. Illinois objected to the structure, because in theory, TIGERS has been limiting the use of attributes which was noted by Terry Dill from Illinois. All industry representatives agreed to the amended structure

Another vote was taken on allowing unlimited restriction to the IAT structure by the states. The vote passed by state and industry, with a few states objecting; Mississippi, North Carolina, Illinois and Maryland.

#### IRSForms Folder

Terry Garber noted that some of the IRS forms which TIGERS uses might need to be reviewed in order to keep current with the IRS. Larry Chapman, Greg Martinez and Terry Garber volunteered to update Penny Berman's version of the 1099G, W2-G, 1099MISC and 1099INT. Penny will be available for consultation, if needed.

#### State Manifest

Greg Martinez reviewed the state manifest which includes the submission type. He noted that states have not been including it in their schemas. Greg noted that some states put their form number; these appear to be states that been involved with MeF from inception. He reminded states, that the submission type is a mandatory element; therefore, states must provide their industry partners with the required information.