

### Question/Comments and Answers

		<u>From</u>
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	Will the scenarios, data bundle, etc. be posted on the DLGF website as was done for 50 IAC 23?	L.L. Low Associates
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	In testing for 50 IAC 23, we were able to script the order of testing of these scenarios as they best fit our system processes, may we expect this leeway again?	L.L. Low Associates
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	Can you give us some idea of how the data bundle will be generated and in what format(s)?	L.L. Low Associates
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	The Department has reviewed and discussed the feedback 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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	The intention behind the "ad hoc" back-up test is to verify	

Question/Comments and Answers

From

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 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 approach 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 GUTS Data on Record Addition and Updates, for Test No. 3 and Test No. 4, are you expecting to see a straight transfer?

**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 Allocations, under No. 2, I believe there is an inconsistency in the naming of the caps: L.L. Low Associates

- 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 synonymous 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

Question/Comments and Answers

From

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.

**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 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 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? L.L. Low Associates

**Question/Comments and Answers**

		<b>From</b>
<b>Answer:</b>	This approach seems to meet the requirements spelled out in the testing scenario and would be deemed an acceptable method.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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.
<b>Answer:</b>	Yes, the automatic calculations (i.e., adjustments to the base) should be done after the manual perusal of selected parcels in a TIF district.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	For Test No. 7, pursuant to IC 36-7-14-39, the base NAV of 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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	Please refer to the 50 IAC 26 section on the following	

Question/Comments and Answers

From

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 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? L.L. Low Associates; Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.

**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 referring 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 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

Question/Comments and Answers

		From
	be sufficient to meet the requirements.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 13 Calculation of 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.	L.L. Low Associates
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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?

**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 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 an 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](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?

**Answer:** Regarding the question on Test No. 2, yes, this scenario does

Question/Comments and Answers

From

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 suspense (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 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 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/Comments and Answers**

		<b>From</b>
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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: <a href="http://www.in.gov/dlhf/files/Modification_Tracking_Templates.xls">http://www.in.gov/dlhf/files/Modification_Tracking_Templates.xls</a>	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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: <a href="http://www.in.gov/dlhf/files/Modification_Tracking_Templates.xls">http://www.in.gov/dlhf/files/Modification_Tracking_Templates.xls</a>	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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.
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question:</b>	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 28 Tax and Billing	GUTS

**Question/Comments and Answers**

		<u>From</u>
	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?	
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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.
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	Regarding Test No. 3, the Department will provide to the vendors a list of fields that are checked for data compliance.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 34 Creation of 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?	Thomson Reuters
<b>Answer:</b>	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 unchanged for the 2014 billing cycle.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	Yes, the Department-provided data bundle will include the CERTDRATES and ALLCERRATE files for Pay 2014.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 6 Deductions, we	Thomson Reuters

**Question/Comments and Answers**

**From**

wanted to bring it to the Department's attention that there is contradiction from the request in Test 5: "Access another property record and attempt to apply the blind or disabled deduction and the Over 65 deduction. Verify that the tax and billing system recognizes this combination is not permissible." Based on previous guidance from the Department, this particular combination has been deemed permissible. Can you please provide direction as to how best to proceed with demonstrating this test?

**Added March 1, 2013**

**Answer:**

The Department has revised the wording of this test to ask that the tax and billing system generate a readily noticeable indicator that reminds users that the particular combination of deduction is not permissible per Indiana Code should the combination be applied to the same taxpayer and that this combination is allowed for the property record only if two or more people are eligible for the deductions independently. This revision is reflected in the Phase I testing scenarios, which are posted to both the Vendors and the Phase I Vendor Certification webpages.

**Question/Comment:**

For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 13: Property Tax Credits and Property Taxes, we have a question and possible concern with the counties being preventing from manually entering tax rates, as is being tested in Test 2(a) . Some counties have annexations where there are agreements in place that the corporation rate is "phased in" over time. (i.e. Johnson Co, Vanderburgh Co.) When a county has this situation the county has always been responsible for setting up this phased in tax rate and tax set. If the county is still going to be responsible for these duties and not the DLGF then it would go against the mandate for tax and billing software to be restricted from entering tax rates.

Thomson Reuters

**Added March 1, 2013**

**Answer:**

Per the requirements of 50 IAC 26-14-2, tax and billing vendors must prevent county users from manually overwriting rates that are contained in a Department-issued budget order.

For credit rates that are not contained in the budget order, tax and billings systems can allow a user to manually enter such rates. The administrative code simply requires that rates included in the budget order are not overwritten, it does not prohibit other credit rates from being applied.

For the issue of abated tax rates due to annexations, the Department recommends including the ability in the tax and billing system to apply an abatement adjustment factor to the applicable fund(s) in the applicable tax district(s). This adjustment factor would not overwrite the certified rate provided in the Department-issued budget order; rather, it would take certified rate and reduce it by the percentage specified in the annexation agreement for that particular year.

Finally, in the particular example of Vanderburgh County, which has a special tax rate for its Seminary Fund, the Department has discussed this with the Auditor of State's Office and the county auditor. For Pay14, we will move forward with changing the administration of this special circumstance. After reviewing the statute, we believe this fund should receive a local credit rate that applies only to this taxing district and will move forward with this next year. Again, this approach would not impact the overwriting of certified rates contained in the Department-issued budget order.

**Question/Comment:**

For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 10: County Auditor Certified Statement, for the CNAV upload specs found on the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage, we are having an issue in trying to mach up the required fields on the State approved form that our system currently generates to the fields in the CNAV file format provided on the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage.

L.L. Low Associates

**Added May 1, 2013**

As you can see in the table below we cannot clearly define which of the States CNAV fields match up to the CNAV upload file names.

The CNAV Upload fields are on the left and the State Forms are on the right. Any assistance or guidance on this will be greatly appreciated.  
Also, can you define "Assessed Valuation of TIF Released"?

<b>Name of Field in CNAV1 DLGF File</b>	<b>Column on Existing NAV Report</b>
State-Assigned Tax District Number	State-Assigned District Number
Bank Personal Property Assessed Valuation	Bank PP AV
Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 1% circuit breaker cap	
Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 2% circuit breaker cap	
Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 3% circuit breaker cap	
Real Estate Net Assessed Valuation	Net Assessed Valuation Real Estate
Business Personal Property Net Assessed Valuation	Net Assessed Valuation Business Personal Property Only
Assessed Valuation of TIF Real Estate	
Assessed Valuation of TIF Personal Property	
Assessed Valuation Withholding	
Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation	
Assessed Valuation of TIF Released	
Assessed Value Changes for Annexations First Effective This Year	
	Minus Assessed Value of TIF Other PP, exd Business PP

Real Estate Net Assessed Valuation	Net Assessed Valuation Real Estate
Business Personal Property Net Assessed Valuation	Net Assessed Valuation Business Personal Property Only
Assessed Valuation of TIF Real Estate	
Assessed Valuation of TIF Personal Property	
Assessed Valuation Withholding	
Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation	
Assessed Valuation of TIF Released	
Assessed Value Changes for Annexations First Effective This Year	
	Minus Assessed Value of TIF Other PP, exd Business PP
	Minus Captured Net Assessed Value
	Minus Assessed Value of TIF Business Personal Property Only
	Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation
	Assessed value applied to Homestead Credit after deduction is applied
	TIF Assessed Value eligible for TIR (TIF established before 12/31/2002)
<b>Name of Field in CNAV2 DLGF File</b>	<b>Column on Existing NAV Report</b>
County Number	
Taxing Unit Type Code	
Taxing Unit Code	
Taxing Unit Name	
Fund Code	
Fund Name	
State-Assigned Tax District Number	State-Assigned District Number

Answer:

Please see our responses in blue below to the questions on the fields in the CNAV files you have raised. Many of the discrepancies are due to new informational requirements that the Department is requiring of the counties. These fields will assist in the Department's data compliance reviews and budget review. Additionally, the CNAV2 (DLGF) File, is a part of the current CNAV document. The "current CNAV document" just referenced and shown below refers to the CNAV report currently available on Gateway. An example of the document can be found by using the following link: [https://gateway.ifonline.org/report\\_builder/Default2.aspx?rptType=assessedValue&rptVer=a](https://gateway.ifonline.org/report_builder/Default2.aspx?rptType=assessedValue&rptVer=a) and selecting the "Certification of Net Assessed Values by District" option. Our anticipated timeline for fully implementing the updated CNAV document – as provided in the specs on the Phase I Vendor Certification page and as will be tested during Phase I certification – is in time for the Pay 2015 submission. Although we will not be requiring the counties (via their tax and billing systems) to produce this updated CNAV file format until Pay 2015, counties may choose to submit some of the new information for Pay 2014. The CNAV form that your system currently generates will no longer be valid or required after Pay 2014. Tax and billing systems will need to have their systems programmed with the updated file specs for CNAV in time for counties to upload this information into Gateway for Pay 2015.

The "Assessed Valuation of TIF Released" field refers to the decision that a redevelopment commission makes annually regarding the amount of captured AV in a given TIF district. A redevelopment commission may choose to release a portion (or all) of the AV captured in a TIF district back to the base per I.C. 36-7-14-39. This is a section on the current CNAV certification. The redevelopment commission must make such a decision before July 15 of each year.

Name of Field in CNAV1 DLGF File	Column on Existing NAV Report
State-Assigned Tax District Number	State-Assigned District Number
Bank Personal Property Assessed Valuation	Bank PP AV
Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 1% circuit breaker cap	New field added to assist in data compliance reviews.
Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 2% circuit breaker cap	New field added to assist in data compliance reviews
Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 3% circuit breaker cap	New field added to assist in data compliance reviews
Real Estate Net Assessed Valuation	Net Assessed Valuation Real Estate
Business Personal Property Net Assessed Valuation	Net Assessed Valuation Business Personal Property Only
Assessed Valuation of TIF Real Estate	This field is part of the current CNAV document. It corresponds with the "Minus Captured Net Assessed Value" field below.
Assessed Valuation of TIF Personal Property	This field is part of the current CNAV document. It corresponds with the "Minus Assessed Value of TIF Business Personal Property Only" field below.
Assessed Valuation Withholding	New field added to ensure AV withholding does not exceed level allowed by law.
Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation	This field is part of the current CNAV document. It corresponds with the "Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation" field below.
Assessed Valuation of TIF Released	This field is part of the current CNAV document.
Assessed Value Changes for Annexations First Effective This Year	New field added to assist in data compliance reviews
This field was removed years ago with State PTRC. It is no longer tracked in the CNAV documents.	Minus Assessed Value of TIF Other PP, exd Business PP
	Minus Captured Net Assessed Value
	Minus Assessed Value of TIF Business Personal Property Only
	Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation
This field will effectively be replaced with the "Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 1% circuit breaker cap" field from above.	Assessed value applied to Homestead Credit after deduction is applied
This was removed intentionally and will no longer be reported to the Department.	TIF Assessed Value eligible for TIR (TIF established before 12/31/2002)

Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation	This field is part of the current CNAV document. It corresponds with the "Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation" field below.
Assessed Valuation of TIF Released	This field is part of the current CNAV document.
Assessed Value Changes for Annexations First Effective This Year	New field added to assist in data compliance reviews
This field was removed years ago with State PTRC. It is no longer tracked in the CNAV documents.	Minus Assessed Value of TIF Other PP, exd Business PP
	Minus Captured Net Assessed Value
	Minus Assessed Value of TIF Business Personal Property Only
	Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation
This field will effectively be replaced with the "Net Assessed Valuation subject to the 1% circuit breaker cap" field from above.	Assessed value applied to Homestead Credit after deduction is applied
This was removed intentionally and will no longer be reported to the Department.	TIF Assessed Value eligible for TIR (TIF established before 12/31/2002)

**Question/Comment:** For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 18: Settlement, per the L.L. Low Associates  
FORM22 file format details as reflected on the Phase I **Added May 1, 2013**  
Vendor Certification webpage, Fund Codes should not have preceding zeros; For example I n the second screen shot from Fulton County's 2013 Budget Order fund 0180 has a preceding zero. Other examples are Fund 0061, 0101, 0124, 0702. Currently our file export generates the Fund Numbers as they appear in the Tax System (which matches the BO); 0180, 0061, 0101, 0124, 0702, etc. Will this be acceptable for future data upload and Phase I testing?

**Answer:** The leading zero in the particular examples you reference represents the first digit of the four-digit fund code as provided in the county budget order and should definitely be included for future data upload and Phase I testing. The wording in the field description is intending to say that with the six character spaces allotted for the Fund or TIF District Code, the four-digit fund code should occupy spaces 1,2,3, and 4 of the field instead of spaces 3,4,5, and 6. In other words, vendors would not format the Debt Service Fund for the Fulton County unit (Fund No. 0180) as "000180" but rather as "0180".

**Question/Comment:** For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 18: Settlement, per the L.L. Low Associates  
FORM22 file format details as reflected on the Phase I **Added May 1, 2013**  
Vendor Certification webpage - "Fund Name as provided in the Budget Order" Example: on a Department-issued Budget Order, the given fund name for Fund 1234 is 'School CPF', however in the FUL data I happen to be working with they have 'School Capital Projects'. This is similar to other of our customers in that there are variations on the fund names from the Budget Order. Currently our file export generates the Fund Names as they appear in the Tax System. Changing them to match the Budget Order would require end user involvement at each county. Will this be acceptable for future data upload and Phase I testing?

**Answer:** The Fund Name field in the Form 22 file extract must match the corresponding Fund Name as provided in the county's budget order. The tax and billing system may allow for the individual counties to label their funds as they see fit for their own processes, but the system will need to be able to translate or "crosswalk" these fund titles in order to generate a Form 22 file extract that contains the same fund names as provided in the budget order. Including the Form 22 in Gateway will allow counties to electronically distribute the Form 22 to their respective local units. No decision has been made on whether or not to require counties to switch to Gateway for Form 22 distribution versus allowing the counties to keep the current practice of generating the Form 22s from the tax and billing system and mailing them out to the individual units. However, since Form 22 generation in Gateway will be an option for counties and since the certified budget information provided on Gateway uses fund names that are contained in the budget orders, the Department feels it is better to be consistent in the naming convention of funds used for both budgetary information and for Form 22 completion. If requested, the Department can provide a current list of fund codes and fund names in Gateway to vendors in order to help create a crosswalk that will translate the funds as they may be labeled in the tax and billing system to the fund titles as they appear in the Department-issued budget order. This will help alleviate the need for the end user in the county to manually perform this crosswalk. On a related note, it is imperative that any four-digit Fund Code reflected in the Form 22 file match a corresponding Fund Code on the budget order.

**Question/Comment:** For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 27: Tax and Billing Thomson Reuters

Question/Comments and Answers

	<p>Management Reports, we are in the process of creating a routine within the software to create the lock guidance tracking document. Do you see it being a problem for you if we program it to produce a CSV file? The reason we would generate it in CSV format versus .xls is because if we create it in Excel, it can cause difficulties for the users when they do not have a Microsoft Excel license or what version of Excel they have. We realize most people have Excel but some users may not. Furthermore, if you have a CSV file and do have Excel installed on your PC the general default for Excel is to associate this type of file with it.</p>	<p><b>From</b> <b>Added May 1, 2013</b></p>
<p><b>Answer:</b></p>	<p>As long as the lock guidance tracking document includes the fields of data that are prescribed in the Department-issued Lock Guidance memo from September 30, 2011, the Department is amenable to allowing vendors generate this document in .csv format.</p>	
<p><b>Question/Comment:</b></p>	<p>On the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage, under the IAC 26 section, what is the purpose of the TIF Pass-Thru Calculation worksheet? The parcels provided are not in the PARCEL data bundle file. If we are to have these parcels in our test database then we will need more information. We will need to have the Current NAV broken down into the Gross AV and respective deductions. The Gross AV will need to be broken down by each assessment type. What is the Base Year for the W. Washington and Glendale Allocation areas? Also what are the parameters for each area? Are they capturing both and personal property or just real only? I only see 18 digit parcel numbers but I don't want to assume anything.</p> <p>Will all TIF testing scenarios will be performed as the tester provides data to the vendor during Phase I testing time?</p>	<p>Thomson Reuters <b>Added July 1, 2013</b></p>
<p><b>Answer:</b></p>	<p>The TIF Pass-Thru Calculation worksheet on the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage is an example of a report that we created in response to an earlier question raised by another vendor on Test Area 9 in the Phase I tax and billing scenarios (please see above). The Department put together a worksheet that showed the type of information that we would be expecting for Test No. 11 in Test Area 9, as well as for several other tests in this test area. This worksheet was actually created before we finalized the data bundle files. Therefore, tax and billing vendors should not worry about trying to tie the parcel records on this worksheet back to the data bundle files. Again, the worksheet is only meant to serve as an example of the type of information we are expecting from Test Area 9 rather than the actual results from the data bundle files themselves.</p> <p>In response to the question of if the TIF testing scenarios will be performed as the Department evaluators provide the data to the vendors, in the December 6, 2012 memo to tax and billing vendors, the Department provided a list of real property parcels in the data bundle that the vendors should consider being in a TIF district. The tax and billing vendors should expect to be working with these parcels referenced in the memo, as well as other property records that the testing evaluators will be providing during the actual testing session. So, the Department evaluators will be asking the vendors to demonstrate all tests in the TIF test area, working with both the property records provided in the memo and with records that will be provided during the actual test session.</p>	
<p><b>Question/Comment:</b></p>	<p>Following up to the CNAV question above (added on May 1, 2013), if we are reading correctly, beginning in Pay 2015 there will be no form required, only the Gateway Upload files (CNAV1 and CNAV2).</p> <p>We base this on the following response from the Department to the earlier CNAV question: The CNAV that your system currently generates will no longer be valid or required after Pay 2014. Tax and billing systems will need to have their systems programmed with the updated file specs for CNAV in time for counties to upload this information into Gateway for Pay 2015.</p> <p>Is this a correct interpretation?</p>	<p>L.L. Low Associates <b>Added July 1, 2013</b></p>
<p><b>Answer:</b></p>	<p>To clarify the statement shown above, the tax and billing system will no longer have to produce the CNAV document under its current format/layout (i.e., the format used for Pay 2013 submission) after the Pay 2014 cycle. However, the tax and billing system should still be able to generate a CNAV document containing the updated fields for NAV subject to the 1-2-3% circuit breaker caps, the updated field for AV withholding, and the updated field for the AV changes for annexations. This document can be summarized at the tax district level and does not necessarily have to be broken down by taxing unit and fund. This report is in addition to the tax and billing system's ability to extract the required data using the updated CNAV file specs and uploading that data into Gateway. Both of these functionalities – generating the CNAV document and generating the file extract to upload into Gateway – will be tested during Phase I.</p>	
<p><b>Question/Comment:</b></p>	<p>On the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage, under the</p>	<p>Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.</p>

Question/Comments and Answers

		<p style="text-align: right;"><u>From</u> <b>Added July 1, 2013</b></p>
	<p>IAC 26 section, for the Property Class Codes and AV Allocation Combination Information document, I am assuming the warnings that need to be generated from certain combinations are directed towards the CAMA system since that application is responsible for the property class codes?</p>	
<b>Answer:</b>	<p>This particular document refers to a test that CAMA vendors will have to demonstrate in Phase I testing. The CAMA vendors will have to demonstrate that their systems provide indicators for incompatible property class code and AV allocation combinations. That being said, although the tax and billing vendors may not be tested on the provision of system indicators for incompatible property class code and AV allocation combinations, the Department still encourages the tax and billing users in the auditor's office to work with CAMA users in the assessor's office to ensure that any incorrect property class code and AV allocation combinations are resolved in a timely manner and that the correct combination is reflected in both systems. To that end, when running data compliance checks, both LSA and the Department look at the data files from the assessor's office (PARCEL file) and the auditor's office (TAXDATA file) to check for incompatible (or at least, questionable) property class code and AV allocation combinations, and both offices are notified if any yellow or red flags raised during this review process.</p>	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	<p>For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 18: Settlement, Item 1 doesn't address the possibility of advance distributions for uploading the Form 22s to the Gateway portal. So for certification testing, we won't be testing for this particular situation, but in practicality, the county auditor will be expected to upload the Form 22 for advances, as well, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc. <b>Added July 1, 2013</b></p>
<b>Answer:</b>	<p>That is a correct interpretation. Although during Phase I testing, the Department evaluators may not ask the tax and billing vendors to actually perform an advance to a local unit, in the "real world" application of the Form 22, if the county auditor (in conjunction with the county treasurer) has done an advance to a local unit, the respective amount of the advance distribution should be reflected on the Form 22. Once the Form 22 upload to Gateway functionality is finalized and ready to be launched by the Department, the county auditor's office will need to upload a Form 22 into Gateway as the advances occur. Further official guidance on Form 22 submittal in Gateway will be released by the Department later on as the Department prepares to launch this functionality.</p> <p>As things currently stand for Phase I testing preparation, tax and billing vendors should expect to generate a Form 22 under the standard settlement/distribution process. If there is variation from this process – like asking the tax and billing vendors to generate a Form 22 for an advance – the Department will let the vendors know ahead of testing. In the event that an advanced distribution is not requested, the fields on the Form 22 pertaining to the advance distributions would simply register 0000000000000000 (using the file format specifications for the Form 22).</p>	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	<p>For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 33: Creation of Files, we have the following questions regarding Item 3 in this test area, as well as the Data Compliance Fields document that is posted to the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Item 3 where the scenario states "... provides a notification...", is this simply a notification to the 'user' when generating the TAXDATA and ADJMENTS files? OR to be provided to the DLGF at the time of Data submission?</li><li>2. Also regarding Item 3, will any of these 'required' Data Compliance Fields being blank or null in the file automatically result in non-compliance? We ask because potentially there are thousands of agricultural properties without Property Addresses. (ex. 40 acre field does not have an address until it is split up and/or built up on and a street address is requested)</li><li>3. Regarding the Data Compliance Field document; there is a requirement to include the 'State Assigned School District Number' as designated on the County Budget Order. Is this supposed to be a required field as this is not something we have tracked or provided in the past and is not provided to us in the PARCEL nor MOBIL nor PERSPROP files?</li></ol>	<p style="text-align: right;">L.L. Low Associates <b>Added July 1, 2013</b></p>
<b>Answer:</b>	<p>1. The notification referenced in Test No. 3 refers to the tax and billing system providing a notification to authorized users in the county auditor's office when generating the TAXDATA and ADJMENTS files.</p>	

**Question/Comments and Answers**

2. As we prepare for the 13 Pay 14 season, the Department – <sup>From</sup> in conjunction with the Legislative Services Agency (LSA) – is considering what level of tolerance will be granted to those fields marked as “required” in the various assessment and tax and billing files while running compliance checks on the data. Certain checks, like including social security numbers in a PERSPROP file submission, will result in an automatic non-compliant status. Generally speaking, however, the Department is amenable to allowing for a certain small level of tolerance in most of its compliance checks that will result in a warning being issued to the county rather than an outright rejection/non-compliant status.

Regarding the concern of having potentially thousands of records without a property address, the property tax management system should be able to provide an approximate property address with the closest street or intersection for those properties where the exact property address may not be known. Using the example that we provided for a similar question on property addresses (in the Data Bundle Q & A document), the county assessing officials will need to populate this field with a logical value in the event that the exact street address is not available. For example, if a parcel resides between 50 N Main Street and 70 N Main Street, the county assessing officials could populate the field with an address like, "Between 50 N Main Street and 70 N Main Street."

3. The State-Assigned School Corporation Number is a required field in the TAXDATA file and is included as part of the compliance review checks conducted by the Department and LSA. Reiterating the comment from Question 2 above, the Department will likely allow for a small level of tolerance in terms of records that may fail the compliance review check on this field, but if the current compliance reviews of Pay 13 tax data are an indication of future years, the Department is not overly concerned about the counties’ ability to populate this field in the TAXDATA file. For the Pay 13 TAXDATA file submission, a large majority of counties (over 80%) submitted their TAXDATA file to the Department and LSA with a school district number for every tax record.

**Question/Comment:** For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 1: Import and Back-up of Files, there is no indication in the testing scenarios about importing the personal and mobile supplemental files. We are assuming we’re doing that in conjunction with the other Pay 13 files referenced Test Area 1 during the actual certification testing session, right? Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.  
**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:** That is a correct assumption. To the extent that vendors will be using the information contained in the supplemental PERSPROP and MOBILE files for Pay 13, these data would be imported as part of the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 1, along with the other files referenced in that test area, during the actual certification testing session.

**Question/Comment:** For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 1: Import and Back-up of Files, below is the lay out of the RAILAV file as specified in 50 IAC 26: Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.  
**Added August 1, 2013**

STATE RAILROAD ASSESSMENTS (appears once per Taxpayer/district combination) - Filename = RAILAV

Column	Start	End	Length	Type	Comments/Format
Property Identifier	1	25	25	A	Unique identifier for the rail assessment
Tax Payer Name	26	65	40	A	Company/Organization Name
Contact Name	66	105	40	A	
Address	106	180	75	A	
City	181	210	30	A	
State	211	212	2	A	
Zip Code	213	223	11	A	Format XXXXX-XXXX
Line Description	224	273	50	A	
DLGF Taxing District	274	278	5	A	Must be 5 digits (e.g.: 41026) The first 2 digits are the county number. Refer to the Certified Tax Rate Order
Track Value	279	290	12	N	
Personal Property AV	291	302	12	N	
Improvements	303	314	12	N	
Contested DLGF Distributable	315	326	12	N	

To arrive at the total assessed value, do we add the last four columns together and place that total in the non-residential improvements (3%) bucket upon import?

**Answer:** Correct. The last four columns – the track value, personal property AV, improvements, and contested DLGF distributable – are summed together and the total value should be imported under the 3% tax cap allocation in the tax and billing system. One additional item to keep in mind is that the summed/total AV value should be rounded to the nearest \$10.

**Question/Comment:** For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 6: Deductions, what is the intention behind the following statement in Test 2: “Vendors: please note this includes moving homestead eligible AV allocations to and from the 1% property tax cap allocation upon changing the standard homestead deduction.”? Is this test supposed to occur at the point in the process after the assessor has rolled gross assessed values to the auditor’s office but before tax bills have been calculated? Or after tax bills have been calculated? Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.  
**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:** Based on the sequence of where this test area falls in the overall context of the Phase I tax and billing testing scenarios, this test is looking at deductions being applied and/or removed to records after the gross assessed values

**Question/Comments and Answers**

From

have been rolled (and balanced) from the assessor's CAMA system to the auditor's tax and billing system but before tax bills have been calculated. During certification testing, the Department evaluators will be looking to see for a real property record: 1) if the tax and billing system reallocates a portion (or possibly all) of the AV under the 2% cap to the 1% cap should the standard homestead deduction be applied to the record, which segues into Test 3 in this test area, and 2) if the tax and billing system reallocates the AV under the 1% cap to the 2% cap should the standard homestead deduction be removed from the record. Please note that looking ahead to Phase II, during the interface testing, the same functionality will be tested when real property gross AVs are rolled from the CAMA system to the tax and billing system. As part of that testing, if a real property record has AV in the 1% cap in the CAMA system but has no corresponding standard homestead deduction tied to it in the tax and billing system, the tax and billing system should reallocate the AV from the 1% cap to the 2% cap buckets.

**Question/Comment:**

For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 7: Economic Revitalization Area Deduction, based on guidance that was provided by the Department regarding the changes to the establishment of abatement schedules for real and personal property located within an Economic Development Area per HEA 1545, the Department noted that vendors may be tested on the abatement schedules that were typically authorized by designating bodies, as well as an alternative schedule that would be specified during the time of testing. Can you give us an idea of what type of alternate schedule is being referred to? We are assuming that it is not to change, for example, an abatement in year 3 of a 10 year schedule to a modified schedule. We would expect that once an abatement is set up on a property for say 10 years that it will maintain that original schedule for the full 10 years.

L.L. Low Associates

**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:**

That is a correct assumption. The Department evaluators do not anticipate testing tax and billing vendors on the ability to change an abatement schedule after a schedule has already been approved and implemented by a designating body; rather, the "alternative schedule" refers to the tax and billing system's ability to establish an abatement schedule that reflects different percentages of AV being abated compared to the traditional abatement schedules as shown on pages 92 & 93 of the Indiana Handbook of Taxes, Revenues, and Appropriations Fiscal Year 2012 Edition. Once the abatement schedule has been established, it would remain in effect for the full duration of the schedule.

The following is just one possible example of an abatement schedule that a designating body could possibly authorize for both real and personal property located in an ERA. The Department evaluators may ask the tax and billing vendors to use a different schedule than this one possible example during the actual certification testing.

**Duration of Deduction (Real and Personal)**

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1st	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2nd	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3rd		0%	50%	50%	50%	50%	75%	80%	80%	80%
4th			0%	25%	40%	50%	60%	65%	70%	70%
5th				0%	20%	35%	40%	50%	55%	60%
6th					0%	15%	25%	30%	50%	50%
7th						0%	10%	25%	30%	40%
8th							0%	10%	15%	30%
9th								0%	5%	20%
10th									0%	10%
11th										0%

**Question/Comment:**

For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 13: Calculation of Property Taxes and Property Credits, what is the intention of having the tax and billing system import the ALLCERRATE file since the CERTDRATES file contains all Department certified tax rates for every fund and taxing unit for each taxing district? Is the ALLCERRATE file simply used as a means to validate the total tax rate by taxing district? Or is it possibly to provide the rates like COIT homestead credit and CEDIT residential credit that would not be contained in CERTDRATES file? Additionally, is there an error in the wording on Page 96 of 50 IAC 26, where it says the ALLCERRATE file "must be submitted by the county auditor to the department.?"

Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.

**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:**

The ALLCERRATE file does contain the homestead credit (CEDIT and COIT) rate for those counties where the rate is applicable. For the ALLCERRATE files used in the 50 IAC 26 testing data bundle, only the certified gross tax rates were provided. However, in a separate memo that the Department provided to the tax and billing vendors in December 2012, the Department instructed vendors to use a certain rate for the CEDIT homestead credit and a certain rate for the CAGIT residential credit for Pay 12; Pay 13 credit rates will be provided during the time of Phase I testing. Normally, though, if the CEDIT homestead credit rate were calculated by the State, this rate would appear in the ALLCERRATE file with a rate type code of "02" (vs. the more commonly used "99" for gross tax rate).

Upon further review, the Department agrees that there is an error in 50 IAC 26-21-4(c)(2). The ALLCERRATE file – just like the CERTDRATES file – should be submitted by the Department to the county auditor for import into the tax and billing system. This error will be corrected when the Department undertakes the process of amending 50 IAC 26 likely in the next couple of years.

Question/Comments and Answers

From

**Question/Comment:** For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 16: Receipt, Posting, and Reconciliation of Payment, Test 3 says the tax and billing system must process a batch file and be able to hold part of the payment in suspense if it errors. Hamilton County has never had to handle payments in suspense. We are thinking that the "payment in suspense" would be posted to a miscellaneous account and entered appropriately on the cash book upon reconciliation of the day's work. Then, the county treasurer would have whatever their internal process is for either applying the "payment in suspense" to the correct parcel or handle as a refund to whoever submitted the batch. The money in suspense must be posted someplace for the county treasurer to balance that day's work, right? Can you confirm this would meet Test 3's requirement?  
Hamilton County/Computronix, Inc.  
**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:** 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 in the batch file is held in suspense (versus rejecting the entire batch file due to just one record being held in suspense). For example, let's say the tax and billing system receives a lockbox file from a lending institution that contains a spacing error or an erroneous character in one of its records. This test is looking at the ability for the tax and billing system to 1) proceed with posting the other records contained in the lockbox file (under the assumption that the remaining records do not contain any spacing errors or erroneous characters) without having to request a new lockbox file with the complete record set that was originally submitted from the lending institution and 2) to ultimately post the record held in suspense after the error contained on the lockbox file for that particular record has been corrected.

**Question/Comment:** For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 27: Tax and Billing Management Reports, is there a current template for the Lock Guidance document? The last thing we know of is from the Sep 30, 2011 Memo which outlines the fields to be included.  
L.L. Low Associates  
**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:** There have not been any changes or updates to the fields required in the lock guidance document since the September 30, 2011 memo was released. Tax and billing vendors should assume that the fields referenced in the memo - parcel number, gross AV certified by the county assessor, certified net AV, modified gross AV, modified net AV, date of modification, and reason for modification - are the current requirements for the document that the Department evaluators will be reviewing as part of Phase I certification testing. If there are any changes in the required fields for the lock guidance document, the Department will notify county assessors, county auditors, and vendors of these changes.

**Question/Comment:** For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 10: County Auditor Certified Statement, looking at the updated CNAV file specifications as reflected on the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage, we do not see a field for the State assessed utility and railroads. To confirm, these values will not be included on the CNAV document. We realize the DLGF already have these values, but we have seen in the past where some counties have forgotten to update these records. Without having a data requirement for these values there isn't a double check to make sure the counties have completed this task.  
Thomson Reuters  
**Added September 3, 2013**

For the AV Changes for Annexations First Effective This Year field in the CNAV document, do you want Gross AV or Net Assessed Value?

Is there a sample of what the CNAV document should look like to match back to the file?

**Answer:** Regarding the question of State-assessed distributable property, your confirmation is correct. Since there is not a separate field for State-assessed distributable property values, these values are not reflected on the CNAV document. The AV Changes for Annexations First Effective This Year field in the CNAV document is looking at net assessed values. At the current time, there is not a report available in Gateway that matches back to the updated CNAV file specifications. The Department's programming team is still in the process of developing the upload module for the updated CNAV document in Gateway. Our anticipated timeline for fully implementing the upload of the updated CNAV document - as provided in the specs on the Phase I Vendor Certification page and as will be tested during Phase I certification - is in time for the Pay 2015 submission.

**Question/Comment:** For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 10: County Auditor Certified Statement, looking at the updated CNAV file specifications as reflected on the Phase I Vendor Certification webpage, are you expecting a report for BOTH the CNAV1 and CNAV2 files? And will the new report be considered, the 'paper' version if you will, of the Auditor's Certificate of Net Assessed Values? If so should they be formatted the same way as the Current CNAV? (i.e. same header information, same footer information)  
L.L. Low Associates  
**Added September 3, 2013**

**Answer:** Yes, as part of Phase I certification testing, we expect tax and billing vendors to generate a report (i.e., certificate of net assessed value) from their systems that covers the information listed in both the CNAV1 and CNAV2 files.

Question/Comments and Answers

From

The Department evaluators will consider this report as the 'paper' version of the Auditor's Certificate of Net Assessed Values. The header and footer information on this report should be the same as the header and footer information on the CNAV document that was submitted for 12 Pay 13.

The Department is mindful that there is a bit of ambiguity in the wording of Test Area 10 in the Phase I tax and billing testing scenarios. To clarify, Test Area 10 is focused only on the certificate of net assessed valuations. The Department evaluators will be asking the vendors to generate and display the certificate of net assessed valuations for Test No. 1. In Test No. 2, the Department evaluators will be checking to see that the tax and billing system can produce the certificate of net assessed valuations in a file format that is compatible with being uploaded to Gateway.

Finally, the Auditor's Certificate (as it is labeled on the Department's webpage: <http://www.in.gov/dlgf/8945.htm>) is still a valid document for Pay 14 and beyond. Although, the Department evaluators do not plan to ask tax and billing vendors to generate this particular document during certification testing, the tax and billing system should be able to calculate, maintain, and output all data required to prepare the Auditor's Certificate.

**Question/Comment:** For the Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 9 Administration of Tax Increment Finance Allocation Areas, for Test No. 7, would it be a problem if the Base AV is adjusted down to match lower NAV on residential parcels. In other words, is it permissible to also adjust the base NAV of residential real property parcels so that if the NAV of a residential real property parcel is lower than the base NAV, the base NAV is adjusted lower to be equal to the NAV of the parcel? **Hamilton County/Compuntronix, Inc. Added October 1, 2013**

**Answer:** For clarification purposes, the following response pertains to TIF districts that do not involve a housing program, as referenced in IC 36-7-14-45.

The following is the statutory language from IC 36-7-14-39 that references the definition of the base assessed value in a TIF allocation area:

"Base assessed value" means the following:

(1) If an allocation provision is adopted after June 30, 1995, in a declaratory resolution or an amendment to a declaratory resolution establishing an economic development area:

(A) the net assessed value of all the property as finally determined for the assessment date immediately preceding the effective date of the allocation provision of the declaratory resolution, as adjusted under subsection (h); plus

(B) to the extent that it is not included in clause (A), 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.

The statute requires the base assessed value of a TIF area be adjusted - through the "plus" clause - to include the net assessed value of residential property that was not included in the total net assessed value during the assessment date immediately preceding the effective date that the TIF allocation area was established. This language states that a TIF allocation area does not stand to gain new increment by adding residential property to the TIF allocation area; rather, the net assessed value from the residential property becomes part of the base assessed value of the TIF allocation area. Test No. 7 in Test Area 9 is testing for this particular scenario.

The statutory language does not provide for a mechanism to remove the residential property assessed value from the base assessed value due to a decrease in assessed value. This is consistent with the Department's application in the previous round of testing under 50 IAC 23. Therefore, the current wording of Test No. 7 in Test Area 9 will remain unchanged. In testing, we will be verifying that the tax and billing system can automatically adjust the base net assessed value to equal the net assessed value of those residential properties that have a higher net assessed value.

In sum, a TIF allocation area does not stand to gain increment with the addition of residential property since the base net assessed value of the allocation area will incorporate or be adjusted to match the net assessed value of those parcels where the net assessed value is higher than the base net assessed value. However, a TIF allocation area may potentially experience a drop in increment if the net assessed value of residential property decreased.

**Question/Comment:** For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 11: Post Certification Thomson Reuters

Question/Comments and Answers

From

Added October 1, 2013

Lock Guidance, Test 5 states, "This includes postings for assessed value changes and changes to property tax cap allocations. The tracked changes must be included in the lock modification tracking document referenced below in the Management Report testing area."

With regards to the changes in property tax cap allocations, how would you expect these to be shown on the spreadsheet?

For example Parcel A:  
Assessor rolls Homestead Land 5,000 and Homestead Improvement of 150,000. During the interface with the auditor there is not a homestead flag for homestead deduction being on file, so during the interface it is changed to NonHomestead Land 5,000 and Non-Homestead Improvement of 150,000. Are these parcels to be listed in the tracking chart?

Parcel B:  
The assessor rolls Agricultural Land value of 50,000 but it should be Commercial Land of 50,000.

Answer:

The Department will be updating the lock guidance document to include fields for the property tax cap allocations. Please note that the fields prescribed in the current lock guidance template will remain the same in the updated document; the property tax cap allocation fields will simply be added on to the current template. County assessors, county auditors, and vendors will be notified as soon as the template has been updated.

In the examples referenced in your inquiry, Parcel A would not be reflected on the lock guidance document. The lock guidance document is looking at changes made to the assessed values and property tax cap allocations of property records after the interface of gross assessed values from the assessor's office to the auditor's office has occurred. The potential reallocation of assessed values from the 1% cap allocation to the 2% cap allocation due to the lack of a homestead deduction should occur during the interface process.

Parcel B would be included in the lock guidance document. Similar to the fields for the certified and modified assessed values that are part of the current lock guidance document, the updated template will include three fields - 1%, 2%, and 3% - for the tax cap allocations of the certified values and three fields for the tax cap allocations of the modified values. As a reminder, the sum of the values listed under the certified tax cap allocation fields should equal the value shown under the certified assessed value field. Likewise, the sum of the values listed under the modified tax cap allocation fields should equal the value shown under the modified assessed value field. For this particular example, there would be \$50,000 shown under the certified 2% assessed value field and \$50,000 shown under the modified 3% assessed value field.

Due to the timing of when the Department will release the template to the county assessors and county auditors, which will likely not be until the first quarter of 2014, vendors may demonstrate the lock guidance template under its current format (i.e., the template that does not include the fields for the tax cap allocations) for Phase I certification testing. However, the Department will expect vendors to generate the updated lock guidance template with the additional tax cap allocation fields during Phase II testing per Test No. 3 in Section C: Reporting and File Exporting of the Phase II testing scenarios.

Question/Comment:

For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 10: County Auditor Certified Statement, this inquiry refers back to the Department's response to a question about the same test area that was added to the Q & A document on May 1, 2013.

Thomson Reuters

Added November 1, 2013

The response states that the CNAV2 file (containing the unit and fund information) is part of the current CNAV document and provides a link to a sample of the "current CNAV document". I printed a report for Adams County and I do not see this data. I'm assuming the Unit information is what should be in the header of the report, but I'm not seeing the fund information. Can you point me in the right direction?

Answer:

The Department is amending and clarifying its previous response to the question about Test Area 10 added to the Q&A document on May 1, 2013. Users with submission rights of CNAV data in Gateway are currently able to receive a report from Gateway that shows total net assessed values by taxing unit - after the data have been manually entered in Gateway by taxing district. An example of this report is shown below. The values listed under the "Total NAV" column on this report correspond to the values by taxing district under the "Adjusted Net Assessed Valuation" column, which is a field reflected on both the current CNAV document and on the updated CNAV1 file specifications.

The CNAV document available in Gateway does not yet include the fund code and fund names, which are two fields that are referenced in the CNAV2 file. When the upload functionality for both the CNAV1 and CNAV2 files is finalized and goes live in Gateway, which will be in effect for Pay 2015 submission, users will be able to access CNAV data broken down by taxing unit and fund.

**Question/Comments and Answers**

From

Certificate of Net Assessed Valuations -- District Unit Match  
To The Department of Local Government Finance

**Brown County**

Unit Name	District Name	Total NAV
<b>BROWN COUNTY</b>		
	HAMBLEN FIRE DISTRICT	\$170,181,880
	HAMBLEN TOWNSHIP	\$293,053,515
	JACKSON TOWNSHIP	\$264,693,291
	NASHVILLE TOWN	\$125,436,341
	VAN BUREN TOWNSHIP	\$124,864,488
	WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$246,406,264
	Unit Total	\$1,224,635,779
<b>BROWN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</b>		
	HAMBLEN FIRE DISTRICT	\$170,181,880
	HAMBLEN TOWNSHIP	\$293,053,515
	JACKSON TOWNSHIP	\$264,693,291
	NASHVILLE TOWN	\$125,436,341
	VAN BUREN TOWNSHIP	\$124,864,488
	WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$246,406,264
	Unit Total	\$1,224,635,779
<b>BROWN COUNTY SCHOOL CORPORATION</b>		
	HAMBLEN FIRE DISTRICT	\$170,181,880
	HAMBLEN TOWNSHIP	\$293,053,515
	JACKSON TOWNSHIP	\$264,693,291
	NASHVILLE TOWN	\$125,436,341
	VAN BUREN TOWNSHIP	\$124,864,488

**Question/Comment:**

For Tax and Billing Phase I Test Area 11: Post Certification Lock Guidance, this question is a follow up to the question and answer pertaining to the same test area that was added to the Phase I Q & A document on October 1, 2013 (shown above).

Thomson Reuters

**Added November 1, 2013**

If Parcel A, as referenced in the example from the question added on October 1, 2013, did get a homestead deduction after interfacing but before the end of the year, the allocation would change from 2% to 1%. Would you want to see that in the lock guidance document? In that case, the assessor's PARCEL.txt file would have the value as homestead and the auditor's TAXDATA.txt file would, too. The change would be a reallocation after interfacing but a reallocation to match what the assessor originally passed.

Related to the lock guidance document but beyond the parameters of certification testing, will the new template be available and required for the 2013 pay 2014 Auditor data submissions?

**Answer:**

The application of the standard homestead deduction to Parcel A in the scenario referenced in the question immediately above would not need to be included in the lock guidance document.

For 2013 Pay 2014, county auditors may use the current lock guidance document (i.e., the template that does not include the additional property tax cap allocation fields). The updated lock guidance template will be required for the 2014 Pay 2015 submission from the county auditors.

**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

Question/Comments and Answers

From

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 Assessment Phase I Test Area 1: Import and 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? **GUTS**

**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 formats, 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 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 **Xsoft**

Question/Comments and Answers

From

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 Assessment Phase I 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/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 assesment system with proceed with combining the parcels.

**Question/Comment:** For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 3: Record Thomson Reuters

**Question/Comments and Answers**

From

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) uses either real time integration or an import file. How would you like 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?

**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 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. Thomson Reuters

**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 Thomson Reuters

Question/Comments and Answers

From

Photograph Maintenance, this seems redundant to Test 2. Perhaps either this test can combined with Test 2 or removed.

**Answer:** There are overlapping elements between Test Area 2 and Test 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 the assessment system's ability to search and access sketch improvements AND photographs for a given property record. The Department's prerogative 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 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

Question/Comments and Answers

From

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 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? Xsoft

**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 elements 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, Xsoft 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.

**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, GUTS 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.

**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 Adjustments Calculation 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 Adjustments Calculation 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 GUTS

**Question/Comments and Answers**

From

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.

**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. 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 acceptable 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

**Answer:** For the report in Test No. 1(d), the vendor may manually 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/Comments and Answers**

		<u>From</u>
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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	Thomson Reuters
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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 oil/gas assessment systems.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	The Department welcomes continual feedback and conversation with vendors regarding the issue of lock guidance as spelled out in 50 IAC 26.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	The Department is currently reviewing and considering the OILGAS and OILGASALL file formats, the issues raised by vendors on the current file formats, and the most appropriate manner to handle the files in relation to Phase I testing. Further guidance will be forthcoming on this issue.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	This particular test 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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	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
<b>Answer:</b>	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.	
<b>Question/Comment:</b>	For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 32: Creation of Files,	AS2

## Question/Comments and Answers

From

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.

**Answer:** The Department is currently reviewing and considering the OILGAS and OILGASALL file formats, the issues raised by vendors on the current file formats, 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 of Files, there is some concern that the importing of the assessment files, as referenced in Test 1, may take several hours to demonstrate and may not be the most efficient use of time during the test session. Is it permissible for the assessment vendors to come to Phase I certification testing with the applicable assessment files from the data bundle already loaded into their software systems? Thomson Reuters  
**Added March 1, 2013**

**Answer:** The Department is amenable to allowing assessment vendors pre-load the assessment files from the data bundle into their respective systems prior to coming in for Phase I certification testing. The Department would request, though, that should an assessment vendor choose to import the files into their system prior to Phase I certification testing, they document how long the entire importation process took and provide the documentation to the Department evaluators at the start of Phase I testing.

**Question/Comment:** For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 20: Future Access to a User-Defined Report, is the focus of this test area more on the assessment system's ability to save the report, the report parameters, or both? We currently will generate the parameters used as part of the output of the report, so a user can know exactly what criteria was used when the report was generated, but wondered if this would be sufficient to pass certification. Could you please shed some light on this? Thomson Reuters  
**Added May 1, 2013**

**Answer:** Test Area 20 for the Assessment Phase I vendor certification is examining both the assessment system's functionality to save a generated report in an electronic format and to save the parameters of the query, as well as the particular layout, used to generate the report. In other words, we're examining the assessment system's ability for an end-user to create a report by specifying the parameters for a user-defined report, saving the parameters and the report itself, and then, being able to run/generate that report again at a later date after the data have been updated (though, for testing purposes, it will be time compressed) without having to start from scratch with specifying the parameters.

**Question/Comment:** For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 1: Import and Back-Up of Files, our plan is to import the applicable files from the data bundle prior to the start of the testing session, and then, export the data for your review to ensure we are using the correct data. As the sales disclosure system is a separate module from our CAMA system, we do not generate and export the SALEDISC, SALECONTAC, and SALEPARCEL files data from the CAMA system. Is this going to be an issue for testing? Thomson Reuters  
**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:** The intention behind having the CAMA system import data from the three SALES files (SALEDISC, SALECONTAC, and

Question/Comments and Answers

From

SALEPARCEL) is two-fold. One, importing sales data into the CAMA system allows the CAMA system to demonstrate the functionality of calculating assessment ratios and annual adjustment factors, including the ability to do time-adjusted sale prices when necessary. Two, importing sales data into the CAMA system serves as a prompt for the CAMA system to capture and maintain in its database a snapshot of the physical characteristics of a property at the time of the sale as required by 50 IAC 27-3-1.

As part of Phase I testing, CAMA vendors will be asked to demonstrate their system's functionality of generating a sales ratio study, which will require - in part - the use of sales data. The Department is more focused on the ability of the CAMA system to use data from the SALES files in order to demonstrate the applicable testing scenarios where sales data are involved rather than how the CAMA system imports the SALES files themselves. There may be certain data elements from the SALES files that the CAMA system would not need (e.g., interest rate on mortgage loan, applied for solar deduction, etc.). To the extent that the CAMA system would not use these data elements to demonstrate the tests in Phase I, the CAMA vendors would not necessarily need to import them as part of testing. In sum, a level of discretion will be given to CAMA vendors in terms of which data elements from the three SALES files will need to be imported into their systems, but the key point is that CAMA systems are able to successfully demonstrate the various tests in Phase I where sales data are involved. **Please note that CAMA vendors will not be expected or asked to generate and export the three SALES files from their CAMA systems.**

**Question/Comment:** For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 12: Improvement Valuation, our CAMA system offers several different types of geothermal heating systems that a CAMA user can select from and that could be classified under the "GEO" improvement type code from Code List 21A. For the records in the IMPROVE file (from the 50 IAC 26 testing data bundle) that have a "GEO" improvement type code, does the Department have a specific type of geothermal system that vendors should use to convert the records with this improvement type code to? Is there a particular value you are expecting when testing for certification, so that we may reverse into which would be the most appropriate geothermal heating system to select?

Thomson Reuters  
**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:** The Department does not have one exact preference on which geothermal heating system from the vendor's CAMA system is used to associate with the "GEO" improvement type code. The Department evaluators will be mindful of the possibility of variation in improvement values amongst vendors based on certain assumptions the vendors used that were not provided in the testing data bundle. Specific to this test area, if the Department evaluators were to ask the vendors to access a real property record with a geothermal heating/cooling system, the evaluators may first ask the vendor which sort of geothermal system they used (i.e., horizontal closed loop, vertical closed loop, return well open loop, etc.), as well as the system tonnage, so that the evaluators can refer back to the cost schedules to verify that the system correctly calculated the true tax value of the improvement. Please note, though, that vendors should be prepared to show the updated true tax value of the improvement under the following scenarios: 1) the Department evaluators ask the vendors to change the criteria behind the improvement (e.g., vendor assumed a 3 ton vertical closed loop system with distribution but evaluator wants to change it to a 3 ton vertical closed loop system without distribution) and 2) the cost schedules have been updated.

**Question/Comment:** For the Assessment Phase I Test Area 32: Creation of Files, for the PARCEL file, on occasion, we will have owner mailing addresses for property records that are international in nature. For these types of situations, how would you like the owner mailing address postal code formatted in the PARCEL file? For example: EH9 2AY?

Thomson Reuters  
**Added August 1, 2013**

**Answer:** Looking at the PARCEL file format in 50 IAC 26, there are ten spaces allotted for both the property postal code and owner postal code fields. The primary format for domestic U.S. postal codes is xxxx-xxxx. International postal codes may follow the format of their respective countries, assuming that the postal code does not exceed the allotted ten spaces. The example you provided should be all right as long as there are ten spaces - inclusive of any blank spaces - allotted to the field in the PARCEL file.