Question/Comments and Answers

		From
Question/Comment:	Are you planning on doing a conference call with vendors anytime soon regarding the new testing as was done for 50 IAC 23?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	At this point, we will not be having a conference call with the vendors. As we receive suggestions on the scripts we will distribute answers.	
Question/Comment:	Will the scenarios, data bundle, etc. be posted on the DLGF website as was done for 50 IAC 23?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	Yes, the draft scripts will be posted online in the "Memo" section of the Department's website. We will also be setting up a new page for the next round of vendor testing over the next month and will post the final scripts when available.	
Question/Comment:	In testing for 50 IAC 23, we were able to script the order of testing of these scenarios a they best fit our system processes, may we expect this leeway again?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The Department has aimed to provide a more logical work flow to the testing scenarios for the upcoming certification process, particularly with the tax and billing scenarios. The Department's general preference is that vendors follow the testing scenarios in the order that they are listed; however, during the testing session, at the evaluator's discretion, requests from vendors to demonstrate the test areas in a different order will be considered.	
Question/Comment:	Can you give us some idea of how the data bundle will be generated and in what format(s)?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	We will be providing the files and formats provided in 50 IAC 26. For certain information not included in these files, we will request that each vendor sets up certain aspects. There are a handful of tests where the vendors will need to use their own dataset, as specified in the scripts. We will post the data bundle and instructions in November.	
Question/Comment:	For the Test Area 1 Import and Back-Up of Files, in the following test: 1. Demonstrate the Tax and Billing System can import the following files: a. TAXDATA (for pay 2012) b. ADJMENTS (for pay 2012) Neither a. or b. are required by 50 IAC 26 for the Tax & Billing to import, they are required for export for the 2010A Annual Data Submission. Also not sure why they have a different pay year; are these to be part of the Data Bundle for testing? Items c. thru g. are our normal import/interface AV files.	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The Department has reviewed and discussed the feedback	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	from the vendors regarding the file importation requirements listed in Test Area 1 for the Tax and Billing System. This test has been revised to have the vendors import **in advance of their scheduled Phase I testing session** the following Department-provided files for Pay 2012 : PARCEL, PERSPROP, ALLCERRATE, and CERTDRATES files. In addition to uploading these Pay 2012 files, the vendors will use these datasets to calculate Pay 2012 tax bills prior to their scheduled Phase I testing session. During the actual testing session, as part of this test area, the vendors will be asked to import the the Department-provided PARCEL, PERSPROP, MOBILE, UTILITYAV, and RAILAV files for Pay 2013. Vendors may "autofill" empty or blanks fields in their data tables to the extent necessary in order to demonstrate the various tests. Additionally, the data bundle will include an list of parcels that should have deductions applied.	
Question/Comment:	For the Test Area 1 Import and Back-Up of Files, specific to a and b, Test 1, we would contend that the TAXDATA and ADJMENTS files are for exporting. Can you please clarify the purpose and requirement of importing these files into the Tax and Billing System? Specific to Test 2, what is the intention of performing an “ad hoc” back up? Is performing a complete back-up sufficient?	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	The intention behind the "ad hoc" back-up test is to verify that the tax and billing system has the capability of performing a back-up of its files on demand. The wording of this testing scenario has been updated to reflect an "on demand" back-up test.	
Question/Comment:	Will the data bundle contain multiple pay years? (As each vendor has differing required database field requirements above and beyond 50 IAC 26 file formats will there be a problem if we ‘auto fill’ this missing information in some fashion.)	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	We understand that there is a large amount of additional data not included in the file formats. We still see benefits to using a consistent data bundle for testing. Our idea is very similar to your suggestion to have vendors ‘auto-fill’ around the missing information. For the tax and bill scenarios, we plan to provide two years of tax and bill files in the bundle.	
Question/Comment:	You stated in the Q & A document “We still see benefits to using a consistent data bundle for testing”. What are those benefits? Roughly how big is the data bundle planned to be? i.e. number of properties? Number of Tax Districts?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The primary benefits to using the data bundle are two-fold: all	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	vendors are being evaluated on the same standards with the same data and the end results should fall within a consistent range across vendors' systems. While the total number of parcels and number tax districts in the data bundle has not yet been finalized, the Department anticipates using a mid-sized county - in terms of the number of parcels – as the basis for creating the data bundle. In other words, the county selected would more than likely contained more parcels than Ohio County but would not be as big as Marion County. Additionally, due to the nature of several of the test scenarios, the vendors should definitely expect that the data bundle will encompass about ten tax districts.	
Question/Comment:	For the Test Area 1 Import and Back-Up of Files, will we have access to the 2013 AV roll files prior to the test so that we can ensure they work and there are no formatting or significant data issues?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The 2013 AV files will be included as part of the Department-provided data bundle. Please note, however, that when using the Department-provided data bundle, the vendors should not necessarily expect to tie their test area results back to actual certified rolled data since the data bundle will contain altered or otherwise fictitiously-created data strictly intended for the purposes of testing. The vendors will receive the Phase I data bundle well in advance of the start of Phase I testing.	
Question/Comment:	For the back-up tests including in the Test Area 1: Import and Back-up of Files, During 50 IAC 23 testing we showed our Audit history and a few sample properties that we know would be changing as a result of testing, then performed a back up for the evaluators as the first step in the testing. Then after the testing was complete we restored from the back up and again showed the sample properties. This was acceptable during 50 IAC 23 testing. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	This approach seems to meet the requirements spelled out in the testing scenario and would be deemed an acceptable method.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax & Billing Test Area 2 Capture and Maintenance of	L.L. Low Associates

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Data on Record Addition and Updates, Test 2.4(c) requires verification that the original record (i.e. the one replaced as a result of changing ownership) is retained as part of the record history. A change of Ownership is a Transfer in our system with a specific process that must be utilized by the operator. There is no property record being replaced, just a transfer of ownership and the resulting update of the Property Record, a Transfer History Record and Audit History record is created documenting the specifics of the change in ownership. These records become available for various search routines to research and/or re-establish historical ownership. This was acceptable during 50 IAC 23 testing. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26?	
Answer:	The intention behind this test is to verify that that when there is a transaction involving a change in ownership for a certain property record, an audit trail is generated for the transaction and includes the requisite items as spelled out in the testing scenario. Assuming this suggested appropach adheres to the requirements spelled out in the testing scenario, it would be deemed an acceptable method.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax & Billing Test Area 2 Capture and Maintenance of Data on Record Addition and Updates, for Test No. 3 and Test No. 4, are you expecting to see a straight transfer?	GUTS
Answer:	Yes, these two tests are looking at a straight transfer.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I,Test Area 4 Tax and Billing System Help Functionality, Test Number 3 references the Top 20 most frequently encountered error conditions. There is no requirement in 50 IAC 26 for maintaining statistics for errors and resulting FAQ's. However we do have in our on-line help common error messages for each option within our software that includes what it is and how to proceed. Additionally, we have an extensive FAQ section that covers what our experience has determined to be the most common questions on how to perform a function or retrieve a special set of data. This was acceptable during 50 IAC 23 testing. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The intention behind this test is to demonstrate that the tax and billing system has the functionality to help users navigate through an issue upon receiving a commonly encountered error message. The wording of this particular test has been updated to provide for more flexibility in the vendor's demonstration of the commonly encountered error message in their system.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 5 Property Tax Cap	L.L. Low Associates

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Allocations, under No. 2, I believe there is an inconsistency in the naming of the caps: a. Land eligible for the one percent tax cap – shouldn't this be referred to as Homestead Land? b. Improvements eligible for the one percent tax cap - shouldn't this be referred to as Homestead Improvement?	
Answer:	The language in this testing scenario pulls directly from the wording in 50 IAC 26-7-7. The state code reference of IC 6-1.1-12-37 for the land and improvements eligible for the 1% cap defines the requirements for "homestead" land and improvement. For all intents and purposes, the Department considers land and improvements eligible for the 1% tax cap synoymous with "homestead" land and improvement.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 5 Property Tax Cap Allocations, In PVD the Cap 2 land and improvements are not broken down into sub categories (farmland, apartment land, etc.) until the DLGF file extract. As long as it shows Cap 2 will that be sufficient?	GUTS
Answer:	The critical component to this test is that the allocation is applied correctly and the tax and billing system can correctly perform a correction of error - if necessary - to a change within a 2% property tax cap allocation and that the changes in a data extract are reflected in the correct 2% bucket in.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 6 Deductions, under No. 1, this Test Scenario needs clarification as to whether a break down on the fly or at time of calc is required for how the deduction is applied to the various Tax Caps is expected? Under No. 3, the scenario indicates a warning message must be generated if a Homestead Deduction is applied and there are no allocations to the 1% allocation bucket. In our system this warning is generated during our 'Standard Homeowners Deduction Mass Update' process and during our Pre-Calculation edit and Calculation processes which provides a list of edits/errors/warnings to the user not at the time of manually adding a deduction. This was acceptable during 50 IAC 23 testing. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26? Under No. 4, this scenario expects a warning if a Homestead Deduction is applied to a Non-Residential (Homestead) parcel. The same edits in our system as No. 3 above applies here. This was acceptable during 50 IAC 23 testing. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	For Test No. 1, the intention behind this particular test is to	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	demonstrate that the tax and billing system can correctly calculate and apply the breakdown of a deduction. If a vendor chooses to demonstrate this particular test via the generation/calculation of a property tax bill, that is acceptable. The vendor suggested methods of demonstration for Test No. 3 and Test No. 4 would be considered as acceptable approaches.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 6 Deductions, Specific to Test 6, please define 'allowable amount of time'. Currently the user is able to add or remove the deduction with any transfer. It is up to the user whether they want to leave them on or carry them from the parent parcel.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Per a January 5, 2011 memo issued by the Department, the following guidance is provided on the allowable amount of time for deductions: "Beginning with property taxes due and payable in 2010, if the deduction is on the property as of the assessment date and the owner of the property becomes ineligible during the calendar year, the deduction should remain on the property for the property taxes due and payable in the following year and then be removed."	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 6 Deductions, Test No.3 and Test No. 4 appear to be redundant. For Test No. 5, counties have received communications from the DLGF in the last 1-2 years that indicate the combination of deductions listed in this test are permissible in certain circumstances (e.g. Husband is entitled to one deduction and wife is entitled to the other deduction). Are you saying that is no longer the case?	GUTS
Answer:	Regarding Test No. 3 and Test No. 4, these two test are intended to target two different area. Test No. 3 is focusing on whether the tax and billing system has the functionality to provide an indicator if a homestead deduction is applied without the proper allocation bucket assigned to the record. Test No. 4 is focused more on whether the tax and billing system has the functionality to provide an indicator if a homestead deduction is applied without a compatible property class code assigned to the record.The final decision on whether or not to rephrase the combination of deduction test in Test Area 6 is currently under review by the Department. More guidance to the vendors on this particular test will be forthcoming.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 7 Economic	L.L. Low Associates

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Revitalization Area Deduction, Item E under this test scenario indicates the specific improvement to receive this deduction must be provided. In our system there is a notes field as part of the deduction which was acceptable in 50 IAC 23. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26?	
Answer:	This approach seems to meet the requirements spelled out in the testing scenario and would be deemed an acceptable method.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 9 Administration of Tax Increment Finance Allocation Areas, Item 7, we'd like to verify that "Automatically" infers processing that may come after manual perusal of the parcels in a TIF District?	Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.
Answer:	Yes, the automatic calculations (i.e., adjustments to the base) should be done after the manual perusal of selected parcels in a TIF district.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 9 Administration of Tax Increment Finance Allocation Areas, specific to Test 7, we would appreciate your insight on this test as we understand certain business rules to apply slightly different. We would not expect the base to be automatically adjusted to equal the current NAV. Even if the parcel is residential the base NAV should retain its true value even if it is in an EDA or Redevelopment area created after 1995 and 1997. If the residential property use changes to commercial, the base NAV should be its original value at the time of the area's creation. The only change in value should be due to TIF neutralization. We would advise that the proper method for a parcel of this characteristic is to have a flag which excludes the AV from being "captured" and included in all TIF calculations. The parcel should still be identified as being within the area and its base NAV denoted because its value still needs to be neutralized annually. Please advise if our understanding is incorrect. Specific to Test 9, we understand this functionality to apply to real estate parcels not personal property. Please advise if this is correct.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	For Test No. 7, pursuant to IC 36-7-14-39, the base NAV of	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	certain TIF districts includes the "net assessed value of property that is assessed as residential property under the rules of the department of local government finance, as finally determined for any assessment date after the effective date of the allocation provision." As the "any assessment date after the effective date of the allocation" clause implies the likelihood of certain parcels having a higher AV than the base NAV, the need to automatically adjust the base NAV for certain TIF districts exists. Therefore, the current wording of Test No. 7 will remain unchanged for Phase I testing. For Test No. 9, the functionality pertains only to real property. The phrase "personal property" will be removed from the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 9 Administration of Tax Increment Finance Allocation Areas, for the data set used, are you expecting the vendor to create a TIF (allocation area) in the system in the presence of the evaluator? For Test No. 11, is this a "pass through", which is a term the state has previous used for allocating some of the captured increment back to the base – or – is it saying the base is to be permanently modified? For the final sentence after in Test No. 13(c) – This references "…create various scenarios with TIF Allocation Areas…" Will these scenarios be created "on the fly" in the presence of the evaluator – or – will we need to create these prior to the testing – or – some other scenario?	GUTS
Answer:	Yes, the vendor will be creating a TIF in the system during the actual testing session. Test No. 11 does refer to a TIF "pass through." Yes, these scenarios will be generated "on the fly" during the actual testing session.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 9 Administration of Tax Increment Finance Allocation Areas, for Test No. 11, can please you provide an example with values? We know there is a difference in our terminology from yours and want to make sure of the intent of this test item.	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	Please refer to the 50 IAC 26 section on the following webpage for an example of the type of information we would expect the vendors to produce in order demonstrate the redevelopment commission test (Item 11) in Testing Area 9: http://www.in.gov/dlgf/7697.htm Please note that –in addition to the redevelopment commission test - this report actually contains information that the vendors would need to produce in order to demonstrate several other tests in Testing Area 9.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 10 County Auditor Certified Statement, Item 2 requires the Certified NAV be in a	L.L. Low Associates; Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	file format compatible with being uploaded to Gateway. This is not a specified requirement in 50 IAC 26 and is not available for testing. Will there be a special upload area available for testing the file and when will real world testing be available?	
Answer:	The Department will be providing the specifications for the Gateway upload to the vendors in the upcoming weeks. Please note that although Gateway will allow for the Certified NAV in 2013, this functionality will not be required until later. In other words, the tax and billing system will not necessarily need to have this functionality fully implemented prior to the actual start of Phase I testing.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 11 Post Certification Lock Guidance, Item 1 of this Test Scenario refers to storing 'multiple assessed value postings' for any given property record. What multiple values is this refereeing to? We currently capture the Certified Rolled AV's and then once calculation is complete lock down and store the Calculation AVs which may or may not differ from those originally rolled. There is a comparison report available indicating the differences between values received from the Assessor versus values used for calculation (e.g. AV changes due to appeals process). This comparison report is created per previous DLGF directions (Lock Guidance in 50 IAC 26 memo September 30, 2011) and indicates ALL changes that are made to assessed values between Assessor rolled values and calculation (i.e. multiple instances).	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The intent of this testing scenario is to tie back to the language referenced in 50 IAC 26-14-2. Specifically, for Test 1, the "multiple assessed value postings" ties back to the requirements spelled out in 50 IAC 26-14-2(3): Any modifications needed to a parcel's net assessed value for appeals, corrections of error, appropriate filing of deduction applications, or other allowable changes in a current tax year may be entered into the system, but must not overwrite the certified gross assessed value data or the certified net assessed value data for that parcel. A separate posting of the modifications shall be created. The certified gross assessed value data, the certified net assessed value data, the modified gross assessed value data, and the modified net assessed value data shall be available for review in the system."	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 11 Post Certification Lock Guidance, Items 3 and 5, by the Certified Net Assessed Values are you referring to the values rolled (certified) from the Assessor to the Auditor at roll OR the values for each property at the time of CNAV submission?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The tests (Items 3 & 5) in the Post Certification Lock Guidance	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	test area refer to the certified net assessed values that would be due at the time of CNAV submission. Please note that in accordance with 50 IAC 26-14-2(1), the vendors must also demonstrate their systems' inability to modify the certified gross assessed value (i.e., the values that are rolled from the Assessor to the Auditor), and this function will be tested in Item 2 of the Post Certification Lock Guidance test area.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 12 County Abstract,the State Auditor's Office only requires counties to produce sections 1 and 5 for their spreadsheet, sections 2 through 4 are all formulas. Do you still want sections 2 through 4 from the tax and billing system?	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	For this test area, sections 1 and 5 of the County Abstract will be sufficient to meet the requirements.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 13 Calculation of Property Tax Credits and Property Taxes, specific to a in Test 2, we are suspect the user community would still want the ability to override and be able to data entry the tax rates and credits. Is this allowable by any means?	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Per the requirements listed in 50 IAC 26-14-2(7)(B), the tax and billing system should prevent the user from manually overwriting rates contained in a Department-issued county budget order. Therefore, in order to demonstrate compliance with this requirement, the vendor will need to demonstrate the inability to override the certified tax rates contained in the Department-issued county budget order. To the extent that a county has adopted local income tax property tax relief credits that are not contained in the Department-issued county budget order, these particular rates will not be tested on in Test No. 2(a) of the Calculation of Property Tax Credits and Property Taxes test area.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 13 Calculation of	L.L. Low Associates

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Property Tax Credits and Property Taxes, Item 2(a) in this test scenario refers to locking down ALL individual taxing unit fund rates after they are imported via the ALLCERRATE and CERTDRATES files. Currently in our system we allow funds/tax rates not included in the files (i.e. local rates) to be manually entered and updated until Calculation is complete. This was acceptable in 50 IAC 23. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26? Item 7 in this Test Scenario refers to the Over 65 Circuit Breaker Credit. In the Data Bundle how many history years will be supplied? In an earlier email we stated we would prefer to have 2 history, one current and two future years for Real with only one future year for Personal and Mobile. We need at least one history year for the purposes of correctly calculating the Over 65 Circuit breaker.	
Answer:	Per the requirements listed in 50 IAC 26-14-2-7(B), the tax and billing system should prevent the user from manually overwriting rates contained in a Department-issued county budget order. Therefore, in order to demonstrate compliance with this requirement, the vendor will need to demonstrate the inability to override the certified tax rates contained in the Department-issued county budget order. To the extent that a county has adopted local income tax property tax relief credits that are not contained in the Department-issued county budget order, these particular rates will not be tested on in Test No. 2(a) of the Calculation of Property Tax Credits and Property Taxes test area. Regarding the inquiry on Test No. 7, the Department will be providing the vendors with Pay 2012 and Pay 2013 data for the PARCEL, PERSPROP, ALLCERRATE, and CERTDRATES files. The Department is requesting that vendors upload and calculate taxes for the Pay 2012 sections prior to the testing period.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 13 Calculation of Property Tax Credits and Property Taxes, for Test No. 2(a) this references updates after uploading the file. Are you saying the county cannot modify information in the file after the file is uploaded but before the taxes have been calculated? We believe the user may have the need to make changes prior to actually calculating the taxes. For Test No.7, are you providing 2 years of data so we will have the prior year's Net Tax for Cap 1 to prove this test?	GUTS
Answer:	Per the requirements listed in 50 IAC 26-14-2-7(B), the tax	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	and billing system should prevent the user from manually overwriting rates contained in a Department-issued county budget order. Therefore, in order to demonstrate compliance with this requirement, the vendor will need to demonstrate the inability to override the certified tax rates contained in the Department-issued county budget order. To the extent that a county has adopted local income tax property tax relief credits that are not contained in the Department-issued county budget order, these particular rates will not be tested on in Test No. 2(a) of the Calculation of Property Tax Credits and Property Taxes test area.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 15 Correction of Error and Adjustment of Assessed values for Various Reasons, Item 3 of this test Scenario indicates a separate posting with the modified data and does not overwrite the certified gross assessed values, ,etc. in the original record. What values are expected to be 'posted'? How are you expecting this information to be displayed? As a total adjustment amount to the Taxes due or a report which shows all the changes made?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The intent of this testing scenario is to tie back to the language referenced in 50 IAC 26-14-2. Specifically, for Test 3, the "separate posting with the modified data" ties back to the requirements spelled out in 50 IAC 26-14-2(3): "Any modifications needed to a parcel's net assessed value for appeals, corrections of error, appropriate filing of deduction applications, or other allowable changes in a current tax year may be entered into the system, but must not overwrite the certified gross assessed value data or the certified net assessed value data for that parcel. A separate posting of the modifications shall be created. The certified gross assessed value data, the certified net assessed value data, the modified gross assessed value data, and the modified net assessed value data shall be available for review in the system." We are not asking vendors to demonstrate that all adjustments can be displayed on the screen simultaneously but rather, should be readily accessible for review by the user.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 15 Correction of Error	L.L. Low Associates

		From
	and Adjustment of Assessed values for Various Reasons, Item 6, this is a new line item in this version of the scenarios. "Verify the system has an indicator that notifies the user of an amended tax return". Do you mean an indicator for a Surplus amount on the property as the result of the adjustment (via Auto AA/CE)? "Verify that the system can correctly calculate and show the refund due in the next year (following the year that the taxes were paid) as a result of the amended personal property tax return and the local decision on how to refund any credit due". Is this also referring to how much Surplus is now on the property as a result of the adjustment? Can you provide and example of this scenario?	
Answer:	The indicator is intended to provide a notification to the user that a taxpayer's personal property return has been amended and that the taxpayer is due a refund in the succeeding year(s). Both this test and the indicator test refer to a policy memo that was released by the Department on June 1, 2011, regarding a change to IC 6-1.1-3-7.5. For more information on the changes regarding the language on amended personal property tax returns, here is the link to the Department issued memo: http://www.in.gov/dlgf/files/110601_-_Amended_Personal_Property_Tax_Returns.pdf	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 16 Receipt, Posting and Reconciliation of Payment, Item 2 of this test scenario requires we accept payments by electronic funds transfer. Does this allow the use of a Lockbox file from a Bank as they would typically receive the EFT payment and then generate a check and lockbox file for the County to process? Item 3 of this test scenario requires holding an individual payment in suspense while allowing other payments in a batch file to be processed. The portion of this 'while allowing other payments in a batch file to be processed' statement does not appear to be what is indicated in 50 IAC 26-7-19, can you please explain what is expected here?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	Regarding the question on Test No. 2, yes, this scenario does allow for the use of a Lockbox file process. For Test No. 3, the intention behind this scenario is to demonstrate that the tax and billing system can still accept and process a batch file of payments from a financial institution even if a particular payment of the batch file is held in suspsense (versus rejecting the entire batch file due to just one record being held in suspense) .	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 20 Sale of Real Property Due to Delinquent Taxes, for Test No. 2, is a "tax sale notice" a listing that could be published?	GUTS
Answer:	Yes, the tax sale notice is a form that could be published. For	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	further guidance on the requirements to be included in this notice, please refer to the County Treasurer's Manual .	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 21 Delinquent Personal Property, Item 1 in this test scenario requires the Tax Duplicate to show delinquencies moved to judgments. We have a process that can be run at anytime to generate an updated Tax Duplicate for a given Tax District which was acceptable in 50 IAC 23 testing. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	This approach seems to meet the requirements spelled out in the testing scenario and would be deemed an acceptable method.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 23 Electronic Notification of Tax Statements, Item 1 in this test scenario requires us to import a file from the Sales Disclosure System to update property records with email addresses. What is the file format? Where is this referenced in 50 IAC 26? Typically we get a file from a Company like SRI that we can import using our ASCII batch update option which was approved as part of 50 IAC 23 testing. Item 3 in this test scenario requires us to be able to generate a PDF of a tax Bill to send via email. Is the expectation that we as part of the print process also attach the PDF to a new email via the users default email?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	Regarding the file importation listed in Test No. 1, the information required for the report comes from the SALESCONTAC and SALESPARCEL files referenced in 50 IAC 26-20-4. From the information contained in these two files, the system can obtain a list of property taxpayers, as well as their corresponding parcel numbers and email addresses, that have elected to have their tax statements generated and sent to them electronically. This report is covered under the purview of 50 IAC 26-11-3(12) and IC 6-1.1-22-8.1. For Test No. 3, yes, the expectation is that as part of the print process, the system also attaches a PDF to a new email via the user's default email. The wording of this test will be clarified in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios to clarify this expectation.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 23 Electronic Notification of Tax Statements, specific to Test 1, the sales disclosure file is not listed. Please clarify the file format used to supply this information per the test scenario.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Regarding the file importation listed in Test No. 1, the	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	information required for the report comes from the SALESCONTAC and SALESPARCEL files referenced in 50 IAC 26-20-4. From the information contained in these two files, the system can obtain a list of property taxpayers, as well as their corresponding parcel numbers and email addresses, that have elected to have their tax statements generated and sent to them electronically.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 25 Generation of User-defined Reports for Tax and Billing, are there any specific examples of reports that will be tested for?	Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.
Answer:	Currently, there are no specific examples of reports that will for certain be requested during the time of testing. The Department will be discussing a variety of possible options during the upcoming months. Generally speaking, vendors should be prepared to generate a series of user-defined reports that will include calculations using the parameters listed under 50 IAC 26-11-1.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 27 Tax and Billing Management Reports, in item 1(e) requires a list of Correction of Errors processed by their current status (i.e. pending, cancelled declined). We cannot find this in 50 IAC 26. Can you please provide a reference for what these statuses are? In item 1(k) it lists a Lock Modification Tracking Document. Is this the same report the DLGF has asked for when making Data Submissions to show what has changed since Certified AVs have been rolled to the Auditor?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	The wording of the test for the Correction of Errors report has been updated and will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios. For the Lock Modification Tracking Document listed under Test 1(k), this is the report referenced in the Department-issued memo from November 14, 2011. Here is the link to the template for the Lock Modification Tracking Document: http://www.in.gov/dlgf/files/Modification_Tracking_Template.xls	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 27 Tax and Billing Management Reports, specific to e in Test 1, the general business rules and workflow of the Auditor's Office is to only process the approved correction of errors from the Assessor. Please advise Indiana Code impacting this process and or how the workflow must be modified to allow a variable status. Specific to k in Test 1, please provide a copy of the prescribed tracking document.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	The wording of the test for the Correction of Errors report has	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	been updated and will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios. For the Lock Modification Tracking Document listed under Test 1(k), this is the report referenced in the Department-issued memo from November 14, 2011. Here is the link to the template for the Lock Modification Tracking Document: http://www.in.gov/dlgf/files/Modification_Tracking_Template.xls	
Question/Comment:	What is the difference between Test Area 27 1(d) (Total number of corrections of errors processed and resulting change in assessed value by taxing district) and Test Area 28 2(a) (Certificate of Error Summary)? For 1 (i), would you clarify whether you are using "deductions" and "exemptions" interchangeably?	Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.
Answer:	The Total Number of Corrections of Errors Processed document is an ad hoc managerial report that may vary its format and/or include additional information fields, based on the request of the individual manager. The Certificate of Error Summary is a document prescribed by the Auditor of State's office as part of their December Settlement process. For Test No. 1(i), the word "exemptions" should have been removed from the original draft on July 27th and will be omitted from the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 28 Tax and Billing Forms and Reports, Specific to c in Test 1, the funds ledger report is not a component of the tax and billing software. This would appear to be available from county financial software. Specific to f in Test 2, the cashbook typically encompasses all county financials and is not a direct component of the tax and billing system. The tax and billing system alone may not contain all of the data variables necessary for this requirement. Please clarify the data variables you are expecting from the tax and billing system and their relevance to the cashbook excise reconciliation page.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors and discussion with the Auditor of State's office, the fund ledger report and the cashbook report will not be tested in Phase I. These two test items will be deleted from the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 28 Tax and Billing Forms and Reports, for Test No 1(c), a fund ledger report is in the county's accounting system. Why is this expected to be a part of the tax and billing system? For Test No. 2(f) , why would the tax and billing system have cashbook data?	GUTS
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors and discussion with the	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Auditor of State's office, the fund ledger report and the cashbook report will not be tested in Phase I. These two test items will be deleted from the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 28 Tax and Billing Forms and Reports, items 1(c) and 1(f) reference Fund Ledgers and Cash book pages. These are functions of the Financial System not the Tax and Billing System.	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors and discussion with the Auditor of State's office, the fund ledger report and the cashbook report will not be tested in Phase I. These two test items will be deleted from the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 29 Histories and Transaction Logs, Item 1(f) in this Test Scenario requires Exceptions be recorded in the Transaction Log (our Audit History of Changes). Where is this referenced in 50 IAC 26 and what exceptions are expected to be recorded?	L.L. Low Associates; Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.
Answer:	For Test No. 1(f), the word "exceptions" should have been removed from the original draft on July 27th and will be omitted from the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 32 Maintenance of Data from Prior Years, this test scenario requires we demonstrate that we can store old data off line in an ASCII format. However 50 IAC 27-7-25 indicates this is only required IF data is purged and stored off line. Our system is designed to maintain all history within the current database which was deemed acceptable in 50 IAC 23 testing. Would we expect this to follow for 50 IAC 26?	L.L. Low Associates; Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.; Thomson Reuters
Answer:	This particular test is based on the requirements spelled in 50 IAC 26-7-25, which says that older tax and billing data (more than two years before the current tax year) that is purged from the tax and billing system must be stored in a flat ASCII file format. Should the vendor demonstrate that their system does not actually purge historical data but rather archives the data within the tax and billing system (or a database connected to the tax and billing system), this particular test will not apply.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 33 Creation of Files, specific to Test 3, please provide a listing of fields in each file that would be deemed noncompliant if they are null or empty.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Regarding Test No. 3, the Department will provide to the vendors a list of fields that are checked for data compliance.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 34 Creation of	Thomson Reuters

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Provisional Tax Statements, specific to Test 1, is there a specific form prescribed by the DLGF for the 2014 provisional tax statement? Specific to Test 3, is there a specific form prescribed by the DLGF for the 2014 reconciling statement, or would the form simply be the TS-1 prescribed for 2014?	
Answer:	The document that will need to be generated in this particular test area is a TS-1 statement. For the purposes of testing, vendors should assume that the current format of the TS-1 will remain unchaged for the 2014 billing cycle.	
Question/Comment:	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 34 Creation of Provisional Tax Statements, will the data bundle also include the Tax Rate files for pay 2014 as indicated?	L.L. Low Associates
Answer:	Yes, the Department-provided data bundle will include the CERTDRATES and ALLCERRATE files for Pay 2014.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 1: Import and Back-Up of Files, what is the purpose of importing all of the files from the IN Extract? Is it to manage the test? The formats, as is, will not be able to be used in real world scenarios, as the file layouts are not robust enough in regards to data to create the parcels and characteristics in question. Is creating a backup via Microsoft SQL sufficient? This passed using a SQL backup for 50 IAC 23 certification.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	The Department has reviewed and discussed the feedback from the vendors regarding the file importation requirements listed in Test Area 1 for the Assessment System. The updated file requirements for importing will be reflected on the final draft of the Phase I testing scenario. The Departments see benefits to using a consistent data bundle for testing. As we realize that the Department-provided data bundle may not provide all the data elements contained within an assessment system, vendors may "autofill" empty or blanks fields in their data tables to the extent necessary in order to demonstrate the various tests. Regarding the question of using Microsoft SQL for a back-up, pursuant to 50 IAC 26-12-3, the property tax management system must be able to backup records by (a) electronically mirroring and storing data in a secondary location; or (b) transferring records to removable media that can be taken to a secondary location. As using a SQL Server to back up data meets the requirement of "electronically mirroring and storing in a secondary location," this method is considered an acceptable approach to use for testing.	
Question/Comment:	For the back-up tests including in the Test Area 1: Import and	GUTS

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Back-up of Files, what is the value of importing these files that do not contain enough information to actually determine CAMA data? What is considered a "response time that is reasonable in light of current industry standards". (This term is used throughout the testing scenarios so we'll only ask this once but it would be helpful to have a general definition of this term in each instance.) Will Oil/Gas CAMA Personal Property and Sales Disclosure all be evaluated and certified separately? Can we choose to not be certified for Oil/Gas at this time?	
Answer:	The Department has reviewed and discussed the feedback from the vendors regarding the file importation requirements listed in Test Area 1 for the Assessment System. The updated file requirements for importing will be reflected on the final draft of the Phase I testing scenario. The Departments see benefits to using a consistent data bundle for testing. As we realize that the Department-provided data bundle may not provide all the data elements contained within an assessment system, vendors may "autofill" empty or blanks fields in their data tables to the extent necessary in order to demonstrate the various tests. Regarding the question of "reasonable response time," there is not one standard length of time for this test. The Department will exercise its discretion in determining what is a reasonable response time and will consider the size of the files being uploaded, as well, in its determination. Regarding the question of certifying different types of assessment system separately, requests from vendors will be considered at the Department's discretion. If the software system is marketed and sold together as a package, the Department's preference is that the system be tested and certified together. Any assessment software that may potentially be used by any county for 2015 and forward must be certified.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 1: Import and Back-Up of Files, specific to Test 1 (p) and (q), this test cannot be demonstrated because the file formats for OILGAS and OILGASALL are incorrect. Demonstration of this test should only be conducted once the State has developed, field-tested, and published new file formats.	AS2
Answer:	The Department is currently reviewing and considering the OILGAS and OILGASALL file formats, the issues raised by vendors on the current file formants, and the most appropriate manner to handle the files in relation to Phase I testing. Further guidance will be forthcoming on this issue.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 1: Import and Back-Up	Xsoft

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	of Files, We do not believe that there is a scenario in an assessor's office that would call for these files to be imported, with the exception of the SALEDISC, SALECONTAC, and SALEPARCEL files. In the case of sales, it is beneficial because the files contain sufficient information to create a complete record upon import; particularly useful for counties that utilize the state online filing for sales disclosures so that the sales can then be imported into the CAMA system and utilized in annual adjustment and ratio studies. If the thought process is that the other files could be used for data conversion, it has been our experience that every conversion is different and requires much more detailed information than what can be pulled from these file formats. In the original Phase 1 test for 50 IAC 23, I believe that vendors were only required to import the PARCEL file, but were allowed to test on datasets from actual county databases. We feel that testing from samples of actual county databases is a more efficient way for all parties involved. Development time on your part to put a dataset together and on our part to code and test for the importing of these file formats, for something that is not used in the real world, is not an efficient use of anyone's time. We hope that the requirement to import these files can be removed (with the exception of the three sales files).	
Answer:	The Department has reviewed and discussed the feedback from the vendors regarding the file importation requirements listed in Test Area 1 for the Assessment System. The updated file requirements for importing will be reflected on the final draft of the Phase I testing scenario. The Departments see benefits to using a consistent data bundle for testing. As we realize that the Department-provided data bundle may not provide all the data elements contained within an assessment system, vendors may "autofill" empty or blanks fields in their data tables to the extent necessary in order to demonstrate the various tests.	
Question/Comment:	For the back-up tests including in the Test Area 1: Import and Back-up of Files, we assume that you are comfortable with us demonstrating backups through SQL Server (and not in some other fashion), which is the standard database engine used in the majority of counties (regardless of vendor) in Indiana. Is this assumption correct?	Xsoft
Answer:	Pursuant to 50 IAC 26-12-3, the property tax management system must be able to backup records by (a) electronically mirroring and storing data in a secondary location; or (b) transferring records to removable media that can be taken to a secondary location. As using a SQL Server to back up data meets the requirement of "electronically mirroring and storing in a secondary location," this method is considered an acceptable approach to use for testing.	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 3: Record Maintenance (CAMA Only), there is no way for the assessment system to know that a two or more parcels are eligible or not eligible for combination, mainly because the database does not know if parcels are contiguous or not. What is the Department's suggested course of action on how to proceed with testing the combination of two contiguous parcels?	Xsoft
Answer:	The Department has reviewed the feedback concerning this test and has determined that the best way to proceed is to have the vendor perform this test in a similar fashion as to how it was performed during the last round of Phase I testing. The Department will provide a list of parcels that are flagged as contiguous so that the assessment system knows which parcels to treat as contiguous. The vendor can then have the assessement system with proceed with combining the parcels.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 3: Record Maintenance (CAMA Only), In each county, the administrative tasks are performed by the auditor and are managed in the Tax and Billing System. Each vendor (GUTS, XSOFT, LOW, and THOMSON REUTERS) useseither real time integration or an import file. How would youlike this test performed? In our opinion, it should be moved to Phase II. Specific to Test 3, please define the term 'eligible parcels'. Does this relate to exclusively to the characteristic of contiguous?	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	For Test No. 3, the term "eligible parcels" references those parcels that could logically be combined together within the same taxing district.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 4: Property Tax Cap Allocations, what would constitute a discrepancy between property class code and cap allocation? From our experience in county environments every parcel is assigned a "primary property class code", however any given property could contain any potential combination of cap assignments. Therefore, we don't believe that a scenario exists where a discrepancy could exist.	Xsoft
Answer:	We agree that a given property could potentially contain a combination of cap assignments. The intention behind this test area is to verify that the system can catch some of the more obvious egregious errors. For example, the assessment system should be able to flag (or provide an indicator for) a parcel with a property class code of 403 (Commercial Apartments) if none of its AV is allocated under the 2% cap. The Department will provide list of combinations that we would expect to generate warning indicators from the assessment system.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 4: Property Tax Cap	Thomson Reuters

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Allocations, Specific to Tests 2 and 3, we are requesting clarification on the exact edits that would be expected during this test. We currently conduct some edits specific to agricultural land types, but would need specificity to fully understand and comply with this test. Specific to Test 4, everything is eligible for a homestead. We believe this test should be removed. Users are currently educated to allocate every land and improvement detail as to its eligibility, and allow the tax and billing system to move the values where a homestead deduction does not exist from Homestead Eligible to Residential eligible.	
Answer:	The intention behind this test is to verify that the system can catch some of the more obvious egregious errors. For example, the assessment system should be able to flag (or provide an indicator for) a parcel with a property class code of 403 (Commercial Apartments) if none of its AV is allocated under the 2% cap. The Department will provide list of combinations that we would expect to generate warning indicators from the assessment system.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 4: Property Tax Cap Allocations, for Items 1 c & d – In PVD the Cap 2 land and improvements are not broken down into sub categories (farmland, apartment land, etc.) until the DLGF file extract. As long as it shows Cap 2 will that be sufficient? For Items 2 & 3 – Any subclass on any parcel can have any combination of cap allocations. We are concerned that the system must warn of a potential error of cap allocation based on subclass code. Even vacant commercial land can be partially farmed.	GUTS
Answer:	The intention behind this test is to verify that the system can catch some of the more obvious egregious errors. For example, the assessment system should be able to flag (or provide an indicator for) a parcel with a property class code of 403 (Commercial Apartments) if none of its AV is allocated under the 2% cap. The Department will provide list of combinations that we would expect to generate warning indicators from the assessment system.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 5: Sketch and Photograph Maintenance, this seems redundant to Test 2. Perhaps either this test can combined with Test 2 or removed.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	There are overlapping elements between Test Area 2 and Test	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Area 5. However, Test Area 2 is more focused on the ability of the assessment system to add a sketch improvement to a property record and to verify that it contains all the necessary elements as spelled out in the test. Test Area 5 is examining theassessment system's ability to search and access sketch improvements AND photographs for a given property record. The Department's perogative is to keep the two test areas separate but will consider potential requests from vendors to have the two tests occur sequentially during the actual testing session.	
Question/Comment:	Due to the fact that Sales Disclosures either exist or don't exist, there does not seem to be a need to include them in the Assessment Phase I Test Area 6: Record Maintenance (for all other non-CAMA assessment systems) activate/intactivate tests. In other words, there would never be a scenario where a Sales Disclosure record would be inactivated, rather if it were erroneously entered, it would just be deleted and therefore could not be reopened.	Xsoft
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors, Test No. 3 and Test No. 4 will not be conducted for the Sales Disclosure systems during the actual test session. These two test items will be deleted from the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios for the Sales Disclosure systems.	
Question/Comment:	For the record retrieval test in the Assessment Phase I Test Area 7: Record Retrieval by Characteristic, Oil/Gas records typically would not have a parcel address; rather they would only have an owner address. In part, this is due to the fact that the rights associated with a single filing can span several real property parcels. Sales Disclosures may or may not have a single parcel address. There are instances of "multi-parcel" sales. In such cases, there is not a parcel address to search by.	Xsoft
Answer:	The Department is mindful that these tests may not be applicable in all instances; however, the vendor will still need to demonstrate that their assessment system has a sufficiently robust record retrieval ability that can handle a variety of scenarios, including instances where a parcel address is available.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 9: Assessment System Help Functionality, we presume the vendor must determine the top 20 most-frequently-encountered error conditions based on frequency in their system. Is that correct?	GUTS
Answer:	The intention behind this test is to demonstrate that the	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	assessment system has the functionality to help users navigate through an issue upon receiving a commonly encountered error messages. The wording of this particular test has been updated to provide for more flexibility in the vendor's demonstration of the commonly encountered error message in their system.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 11: Ability to Update Fields, for Item 2, will it be an issue if the soil's IDs and factors are in a different table than the land valuation table (since they are county wide and not unique to a certain neighborhood)? For Item 3 , will the evaluator be looking at a parcel level for the changes that were made in Items 1 and 2 of Test Area 11 to ensure that the system correctly calculates the new Adjusted Rate and Extended Value? Also, what is the property class change supposed to show?	GUTS
Answer:	Regarding Test No. 2, no, it will not be an issue if the soil's ID's and factors are in a different table than the land valuation table as long as the assessment system has the ability to pull data from both tables to conduct these tests. For Test No. 3, yes, the evaluator will be asking the vendor to pull one or more parcel records to demonstrate that the changes made in Test No. 1 and Test No. 2 have carried through to Test No. 3. The intention behind the property class change test is to demonstrate that if you change the property class code on a parcel of land, the value of the land can change based on the data in the land valuation table. In other words, this test should demonstrate that the change in property class code is pulling the updated value in the land valuation table.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 12: Improvement Valuations, Specific to Test 2, we have not yet received new cost tables from the DLGF since the reassessment tables, which were not even in Excel. Will these tables be in a format that can be imported quickly in the test environment?	GUTS; Thomson Reuters
Answer:	As part of the data bundle, the Department will provide updated cost tables in an Excel workbook. The vendor will need to demonstrate that their system has the capability of taking the existing data in the cost schedules (maintained in their system) and updating the schedules with the revised data provided by the Department.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 12: Improvement	Xsoft

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	Valuations, the format in which the DLGF provides the cost tables is not conducive to "importing" them into a CAMA system. We have had to take the data (in the format provided) and create import scripts to run on the database in order to get the cost tables into our system. What would be ideal is for us to come into the testing with the 2002 Cost Tables loaded, then demonstrate how we update to the 2012 cost tables with scripts that we have already prepared and ran in all of our counties. This would be most efficient for both the DLGF and Vendors in that you would not need to create any special cost tables, and we would not have to create any special scripts. Will this suggested method of cost table comparison be acceptable?	
Answer:	As part of the data bundle, the Department will provide updated cost tables in an Excel workbook. The vendor will need to demonstrate that their system has the capability of taking the existing data in the cost schedules (maintained in their system) and updating the schedules with the revised data provided by the Department. The critical elements to this test are to verify that the assessment system can receive updated cost schedule data and in return, use this updated data to calculate the true tax value of improvements. This test is less focused on whether a certain method of programming is correct and more focused on the critical elments being met.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 13: Entry of Sound Value of a True Tax Value, for Item 1 , what reason codes are to be used on Sound Value? Is it sufficient to have a note describing the conditions that led to the sound value?	GUTS
Answer:	The Department is currently working on updating the Reason for Change Code list to include an entry for sound value. The revised code list will be in place in time for the start of Phase I testing in 2013.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 13: Entry of Sound Value of a True Tax Value , according to Code List 5 in the DLGF's Reason for Change Code list, there is no reason code for sound value. Additionally, sound value is more of a method of valuation as opposed to a reason for change.	Xsoft
Answer:	The Department is currently working on updating the Reason for Change Code list to include an entry for sound value. The revised code list will be in place in time for the start of Phase I testing in 2013.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 15: Assessment Ratios,	Thomson Reuters

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	specific to Test 6, we believe that this test should be removed. Users often indicate they have low numbers of sales. In consulting with IAAO instructors on staff, we feel that this test would not be beneficial to the user.	
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors, the wording of Test No. 5 and Test No. 6 has been revised and combined into one test that will allow the assessment system to still calculate an assessment ratio even if the minimum number of sales are not met. The test now requires that the assessment system provide an indicator to the user if the assessment ratio is being calculated using less than five verified sales. The updated wording for this test will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 15: Assessment Ratios, we are unable to locate a specific number as the "minimum number of verified sales" in the IAAO standard on Ratio Studies. Additionally it is our opinion that there is no minimum number. It could be said that the less you have impacts reliability, but we don't believe there is a magic number.	Xsoft
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors, the wording of Test No. 5 and Test No. 6 has been revised and combined into one test that will allow the assessment system to still calculate an assessment ratio even if the minimum number of sales are not met. The test now requires that the assessment system provide an indicator to the user if the assessment ratio is being calculated using less than five verified sales. The updated wording for this test will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 15: Assessment Ratios, for Item 1 , selecting a random group of 30 parcels would not be logical. Normally this would be done by a neighborhood or one of the classifications listed in Item 4. The 30 parcels would have to have sales in order for this to calculate. For Item 6, preventing an assessment ratio from being calculated seems extreme. A warning would be more beneficial.	GUTS

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
Answer:	Regarding Test No. 1, the intention is to ensure that the system has the functionality in place to allow a user to select a group of parcels in a logical manner (e.g., a neighborhood). Based on feedback from the vendors, the wording of Test No. 5 and Test No. 6 has been revised and combined into one test that will allow the assessment system to still calculate an assessment ratio even if the minimum number of sales are not met. The test now requires that the assessment system provide an indicator to the user if the assessment ratio is being calculated using less than five verified sales. The updated wording for this test will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 17: Annual AdjustmentsCalculation and Entry, shouldn't this test be before Tests 15 and 16? For Item 1a, what does "by segment" mean?	GUTS
Answer:	The wording of Test No. 1(a) has been updated to remove the phrase "by segment." This change will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 17: Annual AdjustmentsCalculation and Entry, specific to Test 1, we request clarification, regarding if this is for land, improvements, or both? We have the functionality available for myriad factors to be applied within GRM Proval.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Regarding Test No. 1, the evaluator will exercise their discretion on testing for both land and improvements during the test session.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 18: Application of Adjustments to Groups of Properties,for Item 1, this test implies that the CAMA system has GIS functionality. In reality, counties have their own GIS systems with which the CAMA system interfaces. How are we to account for this in a test? • Items 2 a & b – This test was a problem in the original certification process. Further clarification is needed because this test is not logical. A neighborhood would be a group of homogenous properties; it would not include a mix of residential with commercial and industrial. Annual adjustments would not be figured on these combinations. • Item 2c – Are you saying an annual adjustment factor should be able to be applied to an individual parcel? That is not logical. All parcels within a neighborhood should have the same factor. Allowing factors on a parcel basis will corrupt the overall neighborhood and be a vehicle for sales chasing.	GUTS
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors, Test No. 1 will be	

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	deleted from this test area. This change will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios. Regarding Test No. 2, the wording of this test has been updated based on vendor feedback in order to allow vendors to select at least 30 parcels in a logical manner. The adjustment factors will be applied to the overall grouping of parcels. This change will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 18: Application of Adjustments to Groups of Properties, specific to Test 1, can we please have clarification in the Indiana Code that requires GIS functionality?	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors, Test No. 1 will be deleted from this test area. This change will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 18: Application of Adjustments to Groups of Properties, typically GIS is external to the CAMA system. In many cases, external GIS data can be utilized in establishment of neighborhood groupings (i.e., neighborhood delineation), it's just not typically done by internal CAMA "GIS" functionality. As CAMA system vendor, we are not attempting certification as a GIS provider. We feel that this is not a relevant test for CAMA.	Xsoft
Answer:	Based on feedback from the vendors, Test No. 1 will be deleted from this test area. This change will be reflected in the final draft of the Phase I testing scenarios.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 19: Generation of User Defined Reports for Assessment, will it be acceptable to provide the raw data to be uploaded to Excel (or other electronic product) for scatter plots and box plots, for example?	GUTS
Answer:	For the test area, the vendor will need to demonstrate their system's ability to generate the user defined reports in the assessment system during the test session, as required by 50 IAC 26-10-1 .	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 20: Future Access to User Defined Report, specific to Test 1, Is Excel the only option? Is PDF acceptable? Depending on the layout, Excel is not always the best selection for format.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Regarding Test No.1, the Department does consider PDF as an acceptble format to demonstrate compliance with this requirement .	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 21: Assessment Management Reports, for Item 1d – Will the data bundle identify adjacent parcels? For Item 1e – Is there a standard format for this report?	GUTS

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
Answer:	For the report in Test No. 1(d), the vendor may mannually determine in a data field which parcel to denote as adjacent - like they did in the combination test in Test Area 3 - and then, generate a report based on this data. For Test No. 1(e), there is not currently a standard format for this report.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 21: Assessment Management Reports, specific to e in Test 1, we would recommend this item be moved to the Tax and Billing Systems scenario.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	The report that shows the list of taxpayers and parcel numbers and email addresses for taxpayers who are requesting to receive their tax statements via electronic mail is a document that will only be tested for Sales Disclosure systems.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 22: Assessment Forms and Reports, specific to Test 1, what other forms and reports are required by law? Could we please have clarification? If no other forms are required, we recommend removing the test.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	The intention behind this particular test is to allow the Department the flexibility of testing for certain forms or reports that may be created/required by code during the intervening year between the release of the final drafts of the Phase I testing scenarios and the start of the actual Phase I testing.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 22: Assessment Forms and Reports, We are unaware of a state prescribed report for Oil/Gas under this statute. Could you provide a sample?	Xsoft
Answer:	Upon further review and feedback from the vendors, these two reports will not be tested for in the Oil/Gas systems. The final version of the Phase I testing scenarios will reflect the fact that these particular tests are not applicable to to oil/gas assessment systems.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 26: Data Integrity, in order to not adversely affect the client base, we would like to schedule a discussion to go over the expectation for this test.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	The Department welcomes continual feedback and conversation with vendors regarding the issue of lock guidance as spelled out in 50 IAC 26.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 26: Data Integrity, specific to Test 1, this test cannot be demonstrated because the file formats for OILGAS and OILGASALL are incorrect. Demonstration of this test should only be conducted once the State has developed, field-tested, and published new file formats.	AS2

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
Answer:	The Department is currently reviewing and considering the OILGAS and OILGASALL file formats, the issues raised by vendors on the current file formants, and the most appropriate manner to handle the files in relation to Phase I testing. Further guidance will be forthcoming on this issue.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 27: Maintenance of Historical Assessment System Data, last time this test was satisfied by exporting older assessment year files. Will this be true for this latest round of tests?	GUTS; Xsoft
Answer:	This particular is based on the requirements spelled in Rule 6 of 50 IAC 26, which says that older assessment data (more than two years before the current year) must that is purged from the assessment system must be stored in a flat ASCII file format. Should the vendor demonstrate that their system does not actually purge historical data but rather archives the data within a database connected to the assessment system, this particular test will not apply.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 29: Change to Parcel Numbers, specific to Test 1, this is now managed by the Tax and Billing system.	Thomson Reuters
Answer:	Per requirements of 50 IAC 26-13-3, the assessment system must have the functionality and ability to change parcel numbers. Even if this particular function is being performed in a different system for certain counties, the assessment system vendors will still be tested on this requirement.	
Question/Comment:	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 32: Creation of Files, specific to Test 1 (p) and (q),this test cannot be demonstrated because the file formats for OILGAS and OILGASALL are incorrect. Demonstration of this test should only be conducted once the State has developed, field-tested, and published new file formats.	AS2
Answer:	The Department is currently reviewing and considering the OILGAS and OILGASALL file formats, the issues raised by vendors on the current file formants, and the most appropriate manner to handle the files in relation to Phase I testing. Further guidance will be forthcoming on this issue.	