State: GEORGIA
Corrective Action Plan for: PAYMENT ERROR RATE
Corrective Action Plan Type: May Update

ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS **In identifying the root cause of each deficiency, please address the following per 7 CFR 275.16(c):**
(1) Magnitude of the deficiency [(defined in 7 CFR 275.15(c)(3)]: Georgia ended FFY 24 with a Payment Error Rate (PER) of 15.65%. The rate was determined from Quality Control (QC) case reviews conducted from 10/23 through 9/24. The Payment Error Rate (PER) should be under 6% to be within federal compliance. The category with the highest error dollar amount is Wages and Salaries. (2) Geographic extent of the deficiency (e.g., Statewide/project area or management unit): This deficiency occurred statewide with each District having at least one Wages and Salaries errored case. (3) Anticipated results of corrective action(s): Improvement of the Payment Error Rate regarding Wages and Salaries monthly until the rate is within the Federal guidelines. (4) High probability of errors occurring as identified through all management evaluation sources: : Earned income errors are still occurring according to Quality Assurance Reviews that are conducted

Deficiency / Identified Root Cause	**Corrective Action Strategies**	**Metric(s)/Evaluation Measure(s)**	**STATUS**	**Completion Date**
Deficiency #1: Wages and Salaries				
Root Cause #1: : Agency failed to verify required information Case managers are not aware that further information may be needed to correctly establish eligibility. In some instances, they are sending a Verification Checklist (VCL) that is confusing and the customer may not understand what verification to return. In other cases, case managers are not sending VCL's at all and are taking client statement for verification of Earned Income which is contrary to Georgia's SNAP policy	Strategy #1: **Acceptable Verification Training** The State Agency (SA) determined through completing case reviews that there was a need for Acceptable Verification training that clearly outlines what must be identifiable in documents submitted by the customers verifying Earned Income. Sometimes policy does not clearly define what must be present in a document for it to be considered acceptable verification. The Training and Professional Development Unit (TPD) is currently in the process of developing Acceptable Verification Training, which will cover how to read specific documents, how to budget Earned Income from the verification used and how to spot counterfeit documents. The training will also include a reference sheet that can be accessed by the case manager during the interview. It will contain tips on how to accurately read check stubs.	After the training has been administered and is completed by case managers, Supervisors will review 2 Earned Income cases per worker, per month that contained verification provided by the customer to determine if the case manager processed the verification appropriately. If the supervisor determines that the case manager did not process the verification appropriately, the supervisor will hold a conference with the case manager to determine if the case manager needs additional training or additional Earned Income case records reviewed	Will be implemented 5/2026	5/2026

	Strategy #2: **Find It Fix It (FIFI) Project Quality Initiative** This initiative focuses on data retrieved from a third-party contractor. They have developed a formula that ranks cases that are "high risk". The formula includes evaluating income and expenses and determining if they are "high risk" cases by comparing these amounts. This initiative consists of Supervisors completing case record reviews on these cases to determine if the income and expenses (deductions) are accurate. Find It, Fix It is the process of completing a case review, determining if the case needs to be fixed and then fixing it. Supervisors are then required to mentor their case managers and discuss the errors that are found.	September 2025 952 cases reviewed – 34% accuracy rate with Earned Income elements October 2025 1237 cases reviewed – 23% accuracy rate with Earned Income elements November 2025 921 cases reviewed – 28% accuracy rate with Earned Income elements December 2025/January 2026 1357 cases reviewed – 31% accuracy rate with Earned Income elements February/March 2026 783 cases reviewed – 27% accuracy rate with Earned Income elements	Ongoing	5/2026
	Strategy #3: **Quality Check Screen in Gateway** Georgia's IES vendor is in the process of developing a Quality Check screen in our Gateway system. This is a system enhancement that will identify potential errors for a case manager before they complete a case. The case manager will be required to address the error or enter case notes explaining why the issue was flagged but does not need correction. This will include if the case manager received the appropriate verification. Phase One of the Quality Check Screen was implemented in 12/2025. Phase Two will be implemented in 5/2026.	Supervisors will complete 2 case reviews per case manager per month to determine if case managers accurately reviewed information in the IES system.	Will be implemented 5/2026	Ongoing
Root Cause #1: Enter the 2nd root cause for the deficiency.	Strategy #4: **Intelligent Optical Character Recognition (iOCR) - Earned Income: used for paycheck stubs.** The State Agency (SA) began utilizing Optical Character Recognition (OCR) in April 2025. OCR scans paystubs to retrieve key data elements for employment verification. It inputs data automatically into income screens on the customer portal and worker portal after customer certification. It ensures only valid paystubs are processed, reducing	65,000 documents uploaded and scanned by iOCR. Out of those, 54,000 documents were reviewed and confirmed by the customer to be pre-filled in the customer and worker portal resulting in a success rate of 82%. Reasons for the 18% failure: incorrect documents, blurry documents uploaded by the customer. 89% of customer portal applications submitted with at least 1 paystub document	Ongoing	Ongoing

	errors and ensuring data integrity. It also decreases the need for case managers to manually review and enter paystub data, enhancing overall application processing efficiency. It reduces the manual effort for customers and minimizes data entry errors. It displays document transaction IDs of uploaded paystubs for easy reference by case managers during case processing.	did not require a manual review from case managers.		
	Strategy #5: **SNAP Interview Assistant**:. Before a customer is interviewed for SNAP, an artificial intelligence agent would collect all reported information for application or renewal. It would guide customers through the information, highlighting any discrepancies to provide opportunities for customers to ensure all relevant information is available. Once the process is completed, the customer would be interviewed by a case manager for final confirmation and given the opportunity to ask questions.	This tool is expected to reduce manual entry errors and improve customer service This enhancement is projected to be implemented in June of 2026.	Will be Implemented June 2026	Ongoing
	Strategy #3: Enter the 3rd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date

ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS
In identifying the root cause of each deficiency, address the following per 7 CFR 275.16(c):

(1) Magnitude of the deficiency [(defined in 7 CFR 275.15(c)(3)]: Enter the magnitude of the deficiency, as defined in 7 CFR 275.15(c)(3).

(2) Geographic extent of the deficiency (e.g., Statewide/project area or management unit): Enter the geographic extent of the deficiency.

(3) Anticipated results of corrective action(s): Enter the anticipated results of corrective action(s).

(4) High probability of errors occurring as identified through all management evaluation sources: Enter the high probability of errors occurring as identified through all ME sources.

Deficiency / Identified Root Cause	Corrective Action Strategies	Metric(s)/Evaluation Measure(s)	STATUS	Completion Date
Deficiency #2: Enter the deficiency.				

Root Cause #1: Enter the 1st identified root cause for the deficiency.	Strategy #1: Enter the 1st corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #2: Enter the 2nd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #3: Enter the 3rd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
Root Cause #2: Enter the 2nd root cause for the deficiency.	Strategy #1: Enter the 1st corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #2: Enter the 2nd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #3: Enter the 3rd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date

ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS
In identifying the root cause of each deficiency, address the following per 7 CFR 275.16(c)::

(1) Magnitude of the deficiency [(defined in 7 CFR 275.15(c)(3)]: Enter the magnitude of the deficiency, as defined in 7 CFR 273.15(c)(3).

(2) Geographic extent of the deficiency (e.g., Statewide/project area or management unit): Enter the geographic extent of the deficiency.

(3) Anticipated results of corrective action(s): Enter the anticipated results of corrective action(s).

(4) High probability of errors occurring as identified through all management evaluation sources: Enter the high probability of errors occurring as identified through all ME sources.

Deficiency / Identified Root Cause	Corrective Action Strategies	Metric(s)/Evaluation Measure(s)	STATUS	Completion Date
Deficiency #3: Enter the deficiency.				

Root Cause #1: Enter the 1st identified root cause for the deficiency.	Strategy #1: Enter the 1st corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #2: Enter the 2nd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #3: Enter the 3rd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
Root Cause #2: Enter the 2nd root cause for the deficiency.	Strategy #1: Enter the 1st corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #2: Enter the 2nd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date
	Strategy #3: Enter the 3rd corrective action strategy.	Enter the metrics or evaluation measures that will be used to evaluate the effect of the strategy.	Select Status.	Enter Completion Date