

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

## *State Next-Generation Electronic Filing Systems for Payroll Services Issues and Design Recommendations*

### **PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

This document is intended to provide background information related to the payroll processing industry<sup>1</sup> as it relates to payroll-related tax administration, and other related payment and reporting obligations. The document provides recommendations to developers of government electronic filing and payment systems, so that such systems can accommodate high volume submissions from payroll service providers.

### **DESIGN FOR HIGH VOLUME SUBMITTERS**

In the employment tax and tax withholding arena, well over one-third of the private sector work force is paid through a payroll service provider that handles the subsequent formatting, payment and reporting of withholding and other payroll taxes to the IRS, and state and municipal tax authorities. Payroll service providers also file over one-third of the W-2s, quarterly wage reports, and new hire reports that employers are required to submit. This concentration of data and funds remittance within a small number of organizations should be excellent news for government agencies, who benefit from the extensive expertise, advanced editing capabilities, high accuracy rates and sophisticated electronic filing systems of payroll service providers.

Understandably, government software development staffs often concentrate on more-familiar stakeholders such as individual taxpayers, and bookkeepers and accountants who typically submit one return or payment at a time. Systems designed for individual submissions are not relevant for high volume submitters, who are often filing thousands of returns to each tax authority on any given day.

#### Which Forms to Convert to Electronic Filing

Some states have insisted that every last return be electronically filed, regardless of cost or burden to the private sector. States are encouraged to evaluate each transaction separately to determine whether conversion to electronic filing is economically justifiable.

Amended returns are a good example. They are far more complex than 'regular' returns, and require separate analysis and programming to convert to electronic filing. Amended returns represent just one percent of the filing volume, yet the size and scope of the separate systems development required to support electronic filing of amended returns will generally exceed that of the 'core' system that will handle the other 99% of the volume. Some payroll service providers may discontinue filing amended returns for clients rather than devote development resources and incur the additional expense needed to file amended returns electronically. Clients who are unaccustomed to return preparation are likely to make mistakes and require substantial support from agency personnel in filing their own amended tax reports.

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information about payroll service providers, visit [www.nprc-inc.org](http://www.nprc-inc.org)

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

Similarly, technical problems occasionally prevent a small fraction of clients from providing quarterly payroll data in electronic format. States should allow for occasional paper filings on an 'exception' basis from taxpayers and payroll service organizations that generally electronically file. Agencies can develop criteria to communicate the expectation that 99.9% of returns should be filed electronically.

## **FORMAT, PROTOCOLS, ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, EDITS AND TESTING**

### Format

States can choose from a number of established electronic file formats, such as FSET, MMREF or NASWA/ICESA, for an electronic filing system. By using a format that already is in use by other federal and/or state agencies, states will benefit from the experience of others in development and testing. Additionally, it is less expensive for private industry to support a format that is similar to those already in use, and states will find a broader audience that is prepared to electronically file using widely accepted standard formats. Unique data formats designed to fit one state's particular needs are discouraged.

Foremost among the emerging electronic file formats is the Federal-State Employment Tax (FSET) standard developed by the Tax Implementation Group for EC Requirements Standardization (TIGERS), part of the American National Standards Institute's Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) X-12. This file format is designed to accommodate all agency filing needs and has been successfully implemented and proven in a production environment. The FSET standard derives from the IRS's 94x standard. The IRS makes the FSET standard available without charge at <http://www.irs.gov/taxpros/providers/article/0,,id=97766,00.html>.

One principal advantage of the FSET standard is that it covers both withholding tax and unemployment insurance tax reporting needs. States can realize development and ongoing reconciliation efficiencies by using a common standard for these two types of employment tax reporting.

Several states currently accept electronic returns, but require the related employee quarterly wage or annual W-2 data to be filed separately, via magnetic media. Optimally a submitter should be able to file quarterly wage and/or W-2 data using the same transmission protocols as the electronic returns.

FSET has a set of field (tag) names that apply to all agencies. Taxing authorities should strive to use the FSET designation for existing fields (tags), regardless of whether or not that agency uses different terminology.

The agency should provide a clear mapping from the data currently collected on paper forms, to the electronic format. Standards should be consistent across electronic filing, magnetic media, and paper to facilitate faster development and more accurate quality control.

***State-specific business rules regarding the use of optional fields should be documented and made available at the state web site.***

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

## Transmission Protocols and Security

Unattended (Application-to-Application) transmission and processing should be supported; i.e. server-to-server capabilities for high-volume filing, versus browser-to-browser. Currently, only Illinois FSET meets this standard. Application-to-Application (A2A) transmission requires an Application Programming Interface (API), including a well-defined data format and a secure transmission protocol. The purpose of the API is to document for the payroll service provider exactly what needs to be done, at the technical level, in order to interact successfully with the state agency's system. The API should address all of the elements listed under "Minimum Agency Gateway Specifications Needed," below. The state tax agency should publish the API at the same time that it is engaged in its internal development program, so that the payroll service provider has time to start its own development program and possibly comment on the agency's implementation decisions. Subsequently, the agency should update the API in advance of any changes to its system.

XML Documents over HTTPS (Web services) is becoming the premier industry standard for A2A. It has been adopted by the new IRS MeF system that will be deployed in January 2006 (although not yet for the 94x series of federal employment tax forms). Web Services uses a Web Service Definition Language (WSDL) document to specify the API between the communicating applications. In addition to Web Services, other A2A transport protocols include SCP, secure FTP and FTP over private network.

Generally payroll service providers prefer internet (https) for file upload/transport. Arrangements involving 'Value Added Networks' (VANs) are viewed as outdated, unnecessary and expensive. Payroll service providers should generally not be asked to install software developed externally, as some arrangements may violate software development control environments.

Agencies should provide broad, overlapping transmission windows for electronic submissions. Agencies should accept late and early electronic submissions, if otherwise filings will have to be made on paper. One example of a system that currently does NOT work well in this respect is the SSA's electronic W-2 filing system. Employers who go out of business before the fourth quarter of the year are required to file Copy A of Form W-2 with the SSA shortly after they cease to do business. But, the SSA's electronic wage reporting system typically is not available until January. This forces employers to find an alternative to SSA's electronic filing system.

Privacy and confidentiality concerns are paramount in A2A transactions. The IRS MeF system has chosen SAML as a security mechanism.. Many systems rely on secure sockets (HTTPS) for encryption and server authentication. The manner in which clients are authenticated varies considerably and remains a matter of concern. The adoption of industry security standards for Web services such as WS-Security allows for well-documented, interoperable, vendor and tool-supported security implementations.

In order to meet the throughput requirements of large transmitters, the A2A transmission protocol must support batched submissions; that is, single transmissions with multiple filings and payments. The filings and payments may or may not be related to each other. The Agency should acknowledge the receipt of each batch, or the filings within each batch, in real-time. This does not imply that the Agency must accept or reject each tax return in real-time, but it should

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

provide some level of validation of the transmission to ensure authorization, completeness and correctness of the transmission.

## Minimum Agency Gateway Specifications Needed

The following suggested Agency Gateway specification is intended to outline the minimum set of specifications needed to exchange information with payroll service provider. The tax agency should take care that all of these elements are included in the Application Programming Interface mentioned above. The Specification may include the following information:

Transport Protocol:

FTP with PGP data encryption

FTP over SSL channel encryption

HTTP over SSL (channel encryption) using standard browser-based authentication. Data also need to be encrypted (PGP or the like) and compressed (PKZIP, GZIP or the like).

3<sup>rd</sup> Party Vendor Software supporting TCP/IP over Internet (such as Tumbleweed Secure File Transfer, Cyclone Commerce – supporting AS1, AS2, AS3 protocol)

URL Name

Port and Port Range

Directories/Folders Naming Convention

File Naming Convention

Encryption/Decryption Method

Compression/Decompression Method

To avoid untimely, ad hoc automated data exchanges, the agency and payroll service providers could agree to exchange data at a set time each day/night. To ensure the correct files are downloaded, a system could be worked out for applying a “post” date-time stamp and a “download transmission” date-time stamp to each file type.

## Authentication

Authentication is the identification of the payroll service provider transmitting a file to the agency gateway. Most agencies intend to pre-register transmitters, and authenticate payroll service provider through a PIN or Password, or through PKI.

Ideally, there will be one PIN/Password/Digital Signature for authentication at the agency gateway per transmitter. There is no need to assign each employer its own PIN/Password/Digital Signature. Each transmission can carry multiple filings for agency (e.g., Withholding tax filings, Unemployment Insurance Tax Reports, Combined returns, Annual Reconciliations and associated payments).

## Acknowledgements

Payroll Service Providers would like to have the following type of Acknowledgements from tax authorities:

TRANSMISSION RECEIPT

TRANSMISSION ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

AGENCY BACK-END ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

## FTA Technology Conference 2005

The TRANSMISSION RECEIPT acknowledges the receipt of each file transmission, and will be provided in real time in the same session as when the transmission is received by the agency gateway. The payroll service provider should be permitted to send multiple transmissions (filings) without having to first pick up acknowledgements waiting for them from a previous transmission. The Transmission Receipt may include the following information:

1. ETIN or other information that identifies the Transmitter
2. TransmissionIDNumber
3. TransmissionTimeStamp
4. FileSize
5. (Optional) Agency defined message to indicate expected turnaround time, for TRANSMISSION ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

Payroll service providers would like the Transmission Timestamp to be usable as proof of timely filing, even if a return is later rejected by Acknowledgement Two or Acknowledgement Three. Payroll service providers would ideally like to reach an agreement with the agencies to use the time stamp for when a return is received on their servers (currently done with individual tax filings with the IRS). Their next choice is to use the Transmission timestamp from Acknowledgement One. For now, "timely filed" is an open issue and defined by each agency. Most agencies and vendors agree the use of the transmission timestamp for Acknowledgement One makes sense. For some agencies this may be a legislative or policy issue.

The TRANSMISSION ACKNOWLEDGEMENT is for each return within the transmission. For rejected returns the Transmission Acknowledgement will indicate at what level the return was rejected, at the Transmitter, Originator or return level. The contents of the Transmission Acknowledgement are specified below under Acknowledgement Two. Acknowledgment Two follows the format of an XML schema that is part of the FSET standard.

The AGENCY BACK-END ACKNOWLEDGEMENT is optional. It may include information generated by the return processing (back-end) system, and includes errors beyond the scope of format validation, such as calculation, and input errors. Again, this third level acknowledgment typically is the same as the agency's traditional reconciliation process; i.e., contacting the employer by letter or telephone.

### EDITS / FIELD VALIDATION RULES

Many states are tempted to expand and strengthen edits, in effect making it harder to file electronically than on paper. States are invited to share any proposed edits for review and comment. Payroll service providers have extensive experience with employment tax payment and reporting, and can provide important information on what conditions actually occur in the real world and why.

For example, employers can be (and frequently are) fined for failing to pay workers when payment is due. For this reason, payroll systems are built to be extremely 'fault-tolerant'; e.g., permitting a new worker to be set up and paid through the payroll system without a valid address, or with a Social Security Number that does not match the worker's name according to the SSA.

## FTA Technology Conference 2005

Tax Authorities should accept published SSA edits for SSNs, because those edits are generally integrated into payroll systems.

Edits can be applied at different levels. For transmission acceptance, the only editing that should occur is for proper formatting and transmitter level information, if validated. Entire transmissions containing multiple employers should not be rejected for imperfections in any detail record. The data that is filed should not be changed, but posted as filed.

Rejecting individual returns with non-fatal error conditions to PSPs is not recommended. Payroll service providers are intermediaries, and generally cannot independently make changes to client data. Any corrections or changes must generally be initiated by the client/employer, so returns should be accepted and posted if at all possible, and the employer notified of any errors via correspondence.

If rejection is necessary because there are problems within a specific employer's return or supporting data (i.e., W-2s or wage data), the employer's entire return should be rejected. States should not reject certain employee-level records while accepting others within an employer's return and supporting wage or W-2 submission. Payroll service providers and software developers/transmitters track employer level submissions, and would be unable to track the rejection of individual employee records within an employer's filing.

States should adopt longstanding federal edits that apply to such data, especially to Social Security Numbers and names.

### **TESTING: PROVIDE ADEQUATE LEAD TIME FOR DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING**

States have generally not allowed enough lead time to implement major changes in filing formats and data transport arrangements; often publishing loosely drafted specifications less than six months prior to a required filing date, and changing them frequently. Insufficient time is often allowed for testing. Payroll providers, in order to properly schedule and implement changes in complex systems, would like at least six months to do so.

Some organizations may wish to submit live data to the test environment in order to more fully test the system (e.g., the detailed edits that will take effect in production). States should be clear about whether the test environment is secure, or whether submitters should use test data only.

Test environments should include all elements of the production environment, including error handling and reporting, file and return acknowledgements, security, naming conventions, etc. to enable a robust test capable of identifying any issues that may arise in production. Test environments should use the same client API as the production environment

Test Environments should be made available at least 60-90 days prior to implementation.

Set forth below are detailed guidelines for a testing process. Agencies and payroll service providers should remain flexible when applying these guidelines, so that the "end" of a successful rollout isn't sacrificed to the "means" of a certain testing process. For example, payroll service providers can help validate that sample tax returns are correct, or provide sample tax returns of

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

their own. And, not all payroll service providers will necessarily support all tax return types from the outset.

## Assurance Testing

Assurance testing is two fold: Set-up TEST Profile registration/Contact Information and return filing. Test scenarios should be provided by the tax authorities, but their use should be optional. Along with the raw test data, there should also be completed returns showing the correct tax computations, reports, or other results for each test scenario.

## Pass/Fail Criteria

TEST Profile registration/Contact Information—The payroll service provider must be successfully authenticated using TEST profile and connected to the Agency Gateway, and also be able to contact Technical Support.

Return Processing—

1. Successfully connect to the Agency Gateway back-end system when initiating the transmission of a test file.
2. Successfully transmit ALL the relevant transaction types (WH, UI, Combined, Annual Reconciliations and/or associated payments) according to the TEST Schedule.
3. Successfully connect to the Agency Gateway system and retrieve the appropriate Acknowledgement file.

## Back up/Contingency systems

Back up or contingency operating systems must be planned in advance. Optimally states should be able to accept a variety of media such as cartridge tapes and CDs, or alternate transmission systems such as a backup secure ftp server, as well as paper filings, in the event of some problem with the filing or transmission systems. Developers should enable authorized state personnel to accept and post electronically filed returns received after the deadline as timely, to accommodate temporary problems with the electronic filing systems. Such contingency systems should also be tested and retested periodically.

## **TAX PAYMENTS**

### Provide for ACH Credit for Tax Payments

ACH Debit is appropriate for individual, one-at-a-time transactions. Payroll service providers routinely originate thousands or even tens of thousands of tax payments to each agency on any given day. They are also generally prohibited from permitting external organizations to access their accounts directly for corporate control and risk management purposes. Therefore, ACH Credit is generally the industry-preferred method of electronic payment. Payroll service providers maintain appropriate edits and conduct routine data exchanges to verify client entity information prior to submitting tax payments or filings to ensure error-free payment posting.

For emergencies, same day delivery of payments, such as via wire transfer, should be accommodated.

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

## TAKE ADVANTAGE OF ELECTRONIC TAX PAYMENTS TO ELIMINATE RETURN FILING REQUIREMENTS

Some states have missed opportunities to truly streamline the tax reporting process by merely converting the existing paper filings to electronic without considering whether such filings remain necessary. For example, while all states accept electronic payments for withholding taxes, four<sup>2</sup> states continue to require a withholding return *in addition to* an ACH Credit payment. The Federation of Tax Administrators specifically developed the “TXP” addenda record that accompanies ACH Credit tax payments so that no paper returns would be necessary. The TXP addenda record includes all information needed to post income tax withholding returns, including:

- Taxpayer ID
- Tax type code
- Tax period end date
- Amount type
- Amount

States should take advantage of the intended design of the Electronic Funds Transfer/ACH system and the “Tax Payment” (TXP) addenda record, which enables electronic payments to serve as both payment and return and follow the standard format only.

In contrast to the well-developed systems for electronic payment of withholding taxes, state systems for electronic payment of unemployment taxes are far more limited. Many states require payroll service providers to pay their clients’ unemployment tax by paper check. States should strive to enable all tax payments, as well as all tax filings, to be made electronically.

### Incentives for Electronic Filing

States may attract more participation by offering advantages and incentives. The IRS, for example, is in the process of making a set of electronic services (“E-Services”) available to submitters of electronic returns.

Such services benefit the state by enabling authorized self-service applications, which free state personnel from handling such requests via phone or correspondence. E-Services should include ability to view client accounts and transactions posted to client accounts, as authorized, and can include electronic notices, error handling, secure e-mail, account resolution capabilities, and so on.

---

<sup>2</sup> AL, HI, NM, WV

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

## ENROLLMENTS AND PRE-FILING APPLICATIONS

### Avoid Unnecessary Enrollments for Electronic Filing

Taxpayer enrollments are a barrier for electronic filing or payment adoption. Developers of electronic filing systems too often start with the premise that taxpayers will have to register separately in order to electronically file their returns, even though the taxpayers are already registered with the agency. This approach may be necessary for employers who file their own returns and/or need to set up an ACH Debit payment method with the agency. Among other things, the taxpayer may need to provide the tax authority with information the agency does not already have, such as their bank account information.

For high volume filers such as payroll service providers, however, this approach is unnecessary and difficult, especially where the agency already has all the information necessary to accept electronic returns. In recent years, many states have implemented duplicative systems, requiring an initial registration to assign taxpayer identification numbers and set up filing requirements, and then requiring separate registration if the taxpayer or their agent wishes to pay electronically; a separate registration if the taxpayer or their agent wishes to file quarterly reconciliation returns electronically; a separate registration if the taxpayer or their agent wishes to file quarterly wage or annual W-2 filings electronically, and so on. Each registration collects similar information, and serves only to prepare the state's electronic filing system to accept a return or payment.

Each such enrollment system becomes an end to itself to some extent, becoming in effect a pre-filing filing, and involving detailed editing and transactions to acknowledge enrollments and to provide feedback if any errors occur. ***Electronic filings should not be rejected due to lack of enrollment.*** Many clients begin using a payroll service provider on short notice, and occasionally shortly before a return is due.

We recommend that states design their systems to accept electronic transactions without requiring separate enrollment transactions. Instead, consider automatically enrolling each taxpayer for electronic filing, or otherwise preparing the electronic filing system to accept such returns without a separate enrollment transaction.

If it is absolutely necessary to maintain an enrollment function, consider use of existing mechanisms between payroll service providers and tax authorities. Payroll services generally have automated systems that report client information electronically to the tax authority.

### Suppress Tax Forms

Take advantage of electronic filings and electronic client lists from payroll service providers by suppressing the mailing of tax forms for clients of such organizations. However, some clients change their arrangements with no notice to their payroll processor, so the tax authority should be prepared to provide tax forms on request by clients.

### Routine Data Exchanges Improve Data Quality

Decades of experience with client taxpayers and tax authorities have proven the necessity of verifying client entity information prior to filing if at all possible. Clients are often not knowledgeable about their status with the tax authorities and are occasionally unsure of their

## FTA Technology Conference 2005

employer identification number (EIN), or their appropriate schedule for filing and depositing payroll taxes. They may provide outdated information (e.g., assigned deposit schedule, tax rate etc.) that relates to a prior year. If there have been entity changes such as the purchase of a business, merger, change in partners etc., the incorrect EIN or other information may be provided. Clients may also be working with a sales representative of the payroll processor who is unfamiliar with tax administration, and of course every human interaction is prone to errors in communication.

In terms of agency correspondence or notices related to tax returns filed, one large payroll service provider found that agencies that conduct routine data exchanges thereby eliminate over 95% of errors that would otherwise necessitate a notice. Said another way, tax authorities that do not operate such programs generate as much as thirty times the number of notices or other correspondence per filing as the agencies that do. Verifying such data on a pre-filing basis is easily cost-justified in terms of improving accuracy and efficiencies for both the tax authority and the submitter.

Routine data exchanges typically take the form of electronic client lists that include every data element deemed by the tax authority to be important for the accurate processing of a tax return; usually federal and state EINs, taxpayer name, any 'short name' or check digit that serves as a posting element, assigned filing and deposit schedule, tax rates, and any data element that may vary by taxpayer and that should appear on the tax form for proper posting to the tax account.

Data exchanges may be conducted quarterly, monthly or more often in order to provide error reports to the payroll service with enough time in advance of filing due dates that any errors can be corrected before a return is filed.

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

## Authorization to File and to Receive Taxpayer Information Generally

Payroll service providers have clients sign a limited power of attorney, usually based on the IRS Form 8655, Reporting Agent Authorization, that expressly permits the service provider to deposit and file specified taxes on their behalf, and to receive otherwise confidential information from the taxing authority. Such authorizations do not relieve the taxpayer from any tax obligations; they remain responsible as if no third party were involved.

A key design consideration is that authorizations extend only to designated tax types (e.g., withholding or unemployment insurance taxes), and only to designated tax periods, beginning with the tax period identified on the authorization and continuing until the taxpayer or payroll service organization notifies the tax authority that such authorization is terminated. In addition, the receipt of a subsequent authorization covering the same taxpayer and tax type should be notice to the tax authority that any authorization on file is revoked and superceded.

With respect to personal identification data (e.g., wage reports, W-2s), access generally should be limited to information submitted by the payroll service provider. This provides access to the party that is responsible for getting a correct file into the agency's system and addresses the confidentiality issue by limiting access to only those files that they have submitted.

Provisions should be made for variations to this general rule, however. Some employers may prefer to authorize a third party to amend the return that the third party did not originally submit.

## Tracking Authorizations

States should consider whether and how to record authorizations between taxpayers and payroll service providers. If necessary, the simplest approach is to record which organization filed a return. The filing of a return unambiguously establishes that a submitter was authorized to do so; otherwise they would not have the information or tax funds to do so. Certainly a payroll processor would have no reason to file a return if they were not obligated by agreement with the client to do so.

With all of the recent attention to privacy protections, however, security personnel often question such an approach. One answer is to consider the risks. Ultimately, there is very little risk to taxpayers or tax authorities, which are merely permitting the electronic submission of a return, and subsequent access to the return data for amendments and problem resolution. Payroll service providers are expressly authorized to receive otherwise confidential information, and while access to the data reported includes sensitive information including names, wages and Social Security Numbers, such payroll service providers are merely accessing data that they reported in the first place.

Where it is necessary to track the relationship of payroll service providers and their clients through some mechanism other than the filing of the return, it is recommended that tax authorities use existing data exchanges for this process. (See "Routine Data Exchanges...")

Payroll service providers have on file a copy of each authorization signed by clients. Typically, the tax authority relies on a 'memorandum of understanding' between the agency and the payroll service provider to establish that the payroll service organization has such forms on file for each

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

client, and will provide a copy of any authorization on request. This approach saves the state from the considerable administrative workload involved in handling copies of paper authorization forms for each client.

Where copies of authorization forms are determined to be necessary, the state should accept the federal Form 8655, Reporting Agent Authorization, and "substitute" forms. Form 8655 includes authorizing language related to state and local taxes. State agencies should consider developing systems to receive such authorizations electronically and respond electronically.

## **AUTHORIZATION ADMINISTRATION FOR ELECTRONIC ACCESS FOR PAYROLL SERVICE PROVIDERS: CONCEPT/DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Electronic Access in Next-Generation Electronic Filing Systems**

In the environment of next-generation electronic filing systems, individual staff members of payroll service providers will need to establish their authorization with various government authorities, in order to file wage and/or tax reports, review related error information, access and download acknowledgement records, access client account information and use the various electronic services made available by government agencies.

Authorized individuals should be able to act on behalf of, and have access to data relating to, each client of the payroll service provider via their single PIN/Password.

Access to data and functions permitted should be appropriately limited to information and transactions that are actually necessary for a payroll service providers firm to fulfill the responsibilities required of them. For example, an associate of a payroll service provider should not be able to access corporate income or sales tax information of a client, and should not be able to change a client's address.

Authority granted to a third party should not affect the taxpayer's ability to access their own account.

### **Two Levels of Authorization Will Be Necessary**

A principal of the payroll service provider (e.g., the person who signs any electronic filing/return originator agreement on behalf of the payroll service) would first register electronically. This person would be designated as the Administrator for all staff members of the payroll service provider who are authorized to have access to the government entity's electronic systems.

The Administrator would provide an initial list of associates who should be authorized to obtain a PIN/password with the agency (to submit wage and/or tax reports, review error information, use e-services etc.). The identified associates would then register and receive a PIN and password.

Alternatively, the Administrator would have the ability to add associates directly to the system; assigning a temporary password that the associate would have to change on their first login. In

# FTA Technology Conference 2005

this case, associates authorized by the Administrator would use their temporary password to obtain a system generated PIN.

## **Administrator Tools & Responsibilities**

The administrator should be able to view a list of all actively enrolled associates, and would be responsible for subsequently authorizing new associates to obtain a PIN/password from the agency.

The administrator would also be responsible for promptly deleting associates from the database when they change jobs or leave the company. Associates should also be able to inactivate their own PIN/password.

---

## **Contacts for Additional Information:**

[www.nprc-inc.org](http://www.nprc-inc.org)

Susan Dunn – VP, Regulatory  
PayCycle  
Susan\_dunn@paycycle.com  
650-543-2014

Anita Gross  
Ceridian Corporation  
714 377-4875  
agross@ceridian.com

Pete Isberg – Director, Government Affairs  
Automatic Data Processing, Inc.  
Pete\_Isberg@adp.com  
610-827-1591

Wendy Seyfert – Agency Relations VP  
Automatic Data Processing, Inc.  
Wendy\_Seyfert@adp.com  
909-394-6842