

Minnesota Eligibility Technology System Executive Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Details

- August 28, 2018
- 10 a.m. - 12 p.m.
- Room 1100, Minnesota Senate Building, 95 University Ave W, St. Paul, MN 55155

Participants

Voting Members

- Nate Clark, MNSure - present
- Janet Goligowski, Stearns County - present via phone
- Deborah Huskins, Hennepin County - present
- Chuck Johnson, DHS - present
- Kari Koob, MNSure - not present
- Nathan Moracco, DHS - present

Non-Voting Members

- Jenna Covey, MNIT - present
- Greg Poehling, MNIT - present

Guests

- Brad Thiel, Anoka County
- Lisa Koenig, MNIT
- Jamin Johnson, MNIT
- Marie Harmon, MNSure

Agenda Items

Call to Order & Welcome

Chuck Johnson, DHS

Chuck Johnson, co-chair, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. Members introduced themselves. Chuck walked through the meeting agenda.

Administrative Items

ESC Members

MOTION: Janet Goligowski moved to approve the draft [June 26, 2018 meeting minutes](#). Greg Poehling, co-chair, seconded. All voting members present voted in favor and the motion was approved.

Periodic Data Matching (PDM) Update

Brad Thiel, Anoka County Economic Assistance Department Director

Brad Thiel of Anoka County advised that Anoka has taken the lead on managing assessor counties, who are responsible for taking a closer look at the PDM field test process. The nine assessor counties, in collaboration with the Department of Human Services (DHS), use a web form to track initial reports and the quantity of any additional reports. To date, there have been four items which have been reported to DHS. One report noted that the participant's projected annual income was not listed on the notice. This report has been listed as a "known item." Another report wants to determine who can attest to a person's death when there is no authorized representative on the case. DHS is currently researching that issue. Brad noted that based on the contact that the assessor counties have had with the participants, the notices appear clear and there have not been any questions on the wording of the documents. Brad stated that even with that being the case, there is still a very low response rate.

Brad mentioned that the first notices went out in the beginning of August, so it is still early in the process. He advised that the next phase in the PDM process is closure. Participants who do not respond will be sent a closure notice in September. Closures will be effective October 1.

Brad reported that on the cases selected, 15.5 percent were sent a notice of discrepancy, and of the people, 10.4 percent had a discrepancy. In Anoka County, Brad noted that there are about 299 discrepant cases. He advised that Anoka believes about 10 percent have responded so far, so approximately 90 percent are in an unknown status. Brad noted that the assessor counties are interested to see how participants respond once the closure notices are sent out. The assessors will be looking at a number of "unknowns," such as if the notices are clear, if there is a rush to contact county offices, and if the correct cases are being closed. Brad noted that if PDM is working as it should, everything should be fine. Additionally, Brad advised that in order to resolve a PDM (meaning a client is calling say their information is correct or incorrect), the process is taking under 5 minutes per case.

Chuck asked if the process and low response rate so far with PDM looks similar to a renewal cycle. Brad advised that he doesn't have any data on the renewal cycle, but noted that with this clientele, it is not unusual for notices to go without a response. Brad said that this is a concern that has been noted. He mentioned that after a participant has noticed their coverage has lapsed, the participants will need to be re-entered into the system, which may cause a large amount of work for county workers. Brad noted there is not a reinstatement process for these cases.

Nathan Moracco asked if there is any reason to believe non-assessor counties would be having a different experience than what has been described. Brad said he has no indication of that.

Nathan asked Brad to describe the assessor counties. Brad noted that the assessor counties includes Anoka, Dakota, Lac qui Parle, Meeker, Olmsted, Scott, Stearns, Swift, Aitkin, Carlton, Cook, Itasca, Koochiching, Lake and St. Louis. Brad advised that the assessor group includes both large and small counties.

Chuck asked Brad to clarify his comments about making changes to cases prior to renewal. Brad noted that there is something known as “inconsistent information,” which refers to an individual reporting different information that would allow a case to close, and currently, there isn’t a procedure or a policy about how to close that case. Chuck said he would follow up with Brad internally to understand the situation better and clarify that there is not a better way to improve the process.

METS IT Program Status Update

Lisa Koenig, Program Management Division Director, MNIT Services @ DHS/MNsure

Jamin Johnson, Director of Enterprise Planning and Administration, MNIT Services @ DHS/MNsure

Lisa Koenig of MNIT presented the [METS ESC Update slide deck](#).

Lisa noted that the 2018 Summer Release successfully deployed on July 15, which included several large product upgrades crucial to the METS platform. Lisa noted that during the summer release, the team deployed one defect fix pertaining to Periodic Data Match, which addressed a problem in which auto-newborn deaths weren’t triggering an end to Medical Assistance coverage as they should when the PDM ineligibility batch is run.

Lisa noted that outside of the release, but also taking place in July, was the first production deploy of GetInsured. An application that allows consumers to search and compare health plans was deployed, replacing the previous plan comparison tool with the GetInsured tool. Consumers can access the new comparison tool through the MNsure.org public-facing website as well as through a link on the plan-shopping landing page.

Next, Lisa presented on the fall release, which includes a number of projects, including the 2019 marketplace setup functionality, which prepares METS for the annual open enrollment period that is set to begin November 1. Additionally, Lisa advised that the fall has a significant MMIS Interface release. She noted that this project will be delivering the final parts of the redesign, which will include the remaining event messages and restructuring of the interface to improve quality and performance. Lisa stated that this release represents a major milestone for the team and will bring to a close the large, lengthy redesign portion of the interface project. Next, Lisa moved to items related to the reasonable opportunity period (ROP) renewals defect fixes. Following the spring release of ROP Phase 1, room was held in the fall release for defect fixes related to that deployment. She noted there are five ROP defect fixes slated for fall. Without them, people going through the renewal process may receive an unnecessary ROP notice, causing confusion. Finally, Lisa mentioned the Defect Management team has scheduled several defect fixes, focused primarily on auto and manual renewals. The fall release is scheduled for production September 16.

Lisa noted that the team is currently experiencing some challenges as they test and find defects that need to be resolved before go-live. They have made adjustments to how they arrange the project code in the testing environments to maximize testing availability and they are also preparing to utilize risk-based testing for the release in order to keep things on track. Lisa advised that they consider this an all hands on deck effort, with staff working nights and weekends to make the release a success. She noted that there are no decisions needed or requests of the ESC at this time.

Nathan asked for a description of the distinction between the last phase of the redesign on the MMIS interface versus general interface improvements. Greg noted there will be items included in future releases to continue to improve the interface. Lisa advised that some of the technical improvements that MNIT is looking forward to include faster, more efficient message processing and the ability to scale up the system during peak processing times, like renewals and open enrollment. Nathan asked if there will be a quicker response from the time something is processed in METS until it has made its way over the MMIS. Lisa advised that she does not have the data but can follow up to confirm.

Next, Lisa presented on the winter release. Lisa reminded the ESC that during at the last meeting, Deb Tibstra of MNIT had reported the winter release would tentatively shift from December 16 to January 13 so it would not coincide with the move from open enrollment to special enrollment. Now that open enrollment has been extended to January 13, METS Program Management Team (PMT) recommends shifting the winter release date to January 6, with the understanding that risk would be minimized and the system would be available on January 7. She noted that MNSure applicants would lose one day of plan shopping with the new schedule.

Lisa then reviewed the work included in the winter release. Lisa noted one project PMT is targeting but has not yet committed to delivering in the winter release: Reasonable Opportunity Period Phase 2 (ROP Phase 2) focuses on pre-eligibility verifications, such as income verifications for MA, which cause eligibility to be denied for individuals who fail to provide verification in a reasonable timeframe. Lisa noted that as was discussed in previous meetings, PMT approved a proof of concept approach that will provide an extended testing runway for ROP Phase 2. She advised the proof of concept approach inserts a new layer of testing into the process that allows MNIT to separate functional testing from overall integration and regression testing. By decoupling these two types of testing, the PMT can ensure that each project gets the full amount of functional testing needed before it is committed to a specific release, and before the code is comingled. Lisa mentioned that PMT should know in early October whether ROP Phase 2 can go in winter or will need to go in spring 2019.

Janet asked if potential difficulties end up being identified sooner with two rounds of testing and pushing ROP phase 2 out to a potential spring date has benefits for county workers processing and being able to work through ROP. Lisa said they she believes Janet is referring to the defects found in functional testing, but the specific issue she is raising comes back to how those defects are prioritized. Lisa noted that a defect that is a blocker or critical would

be fixed before it would deploy, and the issue with the proof of concept is to ensure there is sufficient runway for that functional testing to find those defects. Lisa advised that decisions among the project team will be made about which defects to classify as blocker or critical.

Lisa then presented the 2018 METS roadmap. Lisa pointed out one new project in the section for projects with work planned or underway to deploy in 2019 or later, the Federal Tax Information (FTI) renewals project, phase 2. She noted that this project is designed to safeguard FTI from unauthorized access or disclosure and had been slated for winter release. She advised it is still on the roadmap and PMT is now working to determine which release it will be delivered in.

Janet asked if ROP gets moved to the spring release whether that would allow additional work to be added to the winter release. Greg advised that it does not allow more work to be put into the winter release. Lisa advised there are timelines driving the winter release and such a change would not allow PMT to pick up additional work for winter at this point. Greg noted development was already past the requirements state for winter release. Janet asked there would be enough work if the ROP project moved. Lisa noted that the ROP project team is working and is currently targeting the winter release deadlines, but deployment will depend on when the functional testing can be completed.

Nathan asked if Lisa knew of any changes to requirements for 1095 forms or if it is business as usual. Lisa noted that she did not have any information on that today. Nate Clark advised that there are a few template changes, but those are typical things seen every year.

Janet noted that in the last year or so, MNIT has been able to dedicate a certain percentage of work to defect fixes. She asked MNIT would continue doing that through this roadmap and into 2019. Lisa said that when she talks about the roadmap planning process, she would point out where that particular item comes up.

Lisa continued by noting the high-level process PMT is following for 2019 roadmap planning. She advised step one is ongoing, and the METS PMT is regularly identifying and scoring proposed new project work that comes through the project gateway. Next, PMT needs to determine planning assumptions, available capacity, identify specific project candidates for 2019, define their scope, and gather level of effort (LOE) information for the proposed projects and ongoing efforts. Lisa advised that they will be able to leverage capacity planning and level of effort work completed last year to assist in Roadmap planning efforts this year. Lisa noted that this is what Janet was referring to in her previous question. From there, the METS PMT will rank and prioritize individual projects, identify 2019 release timeframes, and prepare a roadmap recommendation for ESC to review and approve.

Greg asked Lisa if they have an estimated timeline of when the ESC will see a roadmap for 2019. Lisa noted that she does not have a specific timeline.

Continuing, Lisa advised that one of the major funding sources for the development of Medicaid-related functionality is the implementation advance planning document (IAPD). On July 31, DHS submitted the IAPD update for federal fiscal year 2019. She mentioned that the

update provides input into the METS 2019 roadmap. IAPD funding provides approximately 90 percent federal funding, based on a 10 percent state match. She noted that funding follows the federal fiscal year, which runs from October 1, 2018 to September 30, 2019. Lisa stated that this year's METS IAPD budget is \$45 million.

Lisa noted one effort not included in the 2019 METS IAPD projects - the annual Curam Upgrade. Lisa advised that PMT tries to incorporate one product upgrade each year so that Curam is kept current with fixes, new functionality, and technical improvements provided in each new version of software. Lisa said PMT has evaluated the return on investment of the number of defect/product fixes in each annual release compared to the expense of time, resources and funding to implement. She noted that MNIT technical leadership has also discussed with IBM Curam leadership how long they can expect each version to be supported by the product development team. Given these critical inputs, PMT has determined it is best to defer the upgrade for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2019 to FFY 2020.

Lisa continued her presentation with an update on the program status for all active METS projects. Lisa mentioned there are currently three projects in red. The MMIS interface has a number of defects that need to be resolved and the project team will be challenged to get all the related testing completed in time. Lisa noted the team is mitigating risk by parallel testing during user acceptance testing, prioritizing test cases, and investigating other avenues to ensure the deployment is on schedule for the fall release.

Continuing, Lisa noted that the ROP phase 2 is in red for issues related to the winter release. Phase 2 recently went into red due to lost days in the test environment and because the date scheduled to determine if the project can go into the winter release moved up from mid-October to early October, reducing the testing timeframe. Lisa advised that a design gap identified in early rounds of testing has been resolved, but it affected 50 test cases that now need to be modified.

Next, Lisa noted infrastructure improvements is an ongoing effort and is in red due to a reporting issue under the compliance and audits subproject. The team is challenged with the consolidation of extremely large audit and compliance data tables, as well as ensuring that the reporting has a satisfactory response time. She expects this project to be Red until early fall, as the project team is not planning to re-baseline the schedule.

Deborah Huskins asked Lisa to talk about the business readiness of unique person ID and why the project is in grey. Lisa noted that they use grey to label a project as "in initiation." This means they are gathering a team and getting started, but don't have something to baseline against to say whether it is green, yellow, or red.

Jamin Johnson of MNIT introduced himself and began with an overview of the [METS Fiscal Report for Quarter Ending June 30, 2018](#). Jamin noted that the second page provides a four year view, including historical information for state fiscal years (SFY) 16 and 17 and budget information for this year and next. Jamin advised there were no changes to SFY16, SFY17, and SFY18 budgets. For the SFY19 budget, the development budget shown of \$19.7 million reflects funding from the remainder of the FFY18 APD, which ends September 29.

Jamin noted that the report shows planned underspending over these three months, part of which is being reinvested in the FFY19 E&E APD. He advised that on the next page the SFY18 development budget has a pressure, and about \$800,000 will go toward this to stay within a federal fiscal year but cross state fiscal years. Jamin advised that under development expenditures, there was a negative \$736,000 for FY19 service contracts. While from a federal approval standpoint, staff augmentation and service contracts are considered a single category, the report has broken them out to provide a better understanding of the type of resources being used. He advised the easiest way to think about it is to anticipate within SFY19, the staff augmentation line will be used to offset the negative service contracts line.

Regarding DHS development, at the end of April the DHS Enterprise Architecture Board (EAB) set a METS development target for FFY19 of about \$45 million. Jamin noted that in late July DHS submitted their FFY19 APD to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) for federal approval. They expect final approval before October 1, and then will include it in the budget in the next quarterly report. Jamin advised that MNsure is also planning development of the METS platform in SFY19. In particular, MNsure is focused on the integration of the GetInsured solution. As mentioned in the footnote, the MNsure Board approved a development budget of \$5.3 million, which will also be reflected in the next quarterly report.

For operations, Jamin advised his team is currently still basing the SFY19 operations budget on the SFY18 operations budget. As the ESC can see, they anticipate about a 9% underspending in FY18.

Jamin noted that overall, there are no major concerns with the budget. Jamin advised that on a budget of \$45 million, year to date expenditures total \$37.5 million and about \$8 million is encumbered or estimated to be spent within the fiscal year. For the first time since his team has been presenting this report, expenditure show an overall overage for development, as their estimated end balance for the state fiscal year end is negative \$486,000. This is about an \$800,000 pressure in the E&E development budget and an estimated remaining balance of \$300,000 for private-only development. He advised that in regards to the \$800,000 pressure, there are two things to consider. First, there is over \$7.1 million in estimated encumbrances, so the actual pressure may not fully be realized if a few activities don't occur within SFY18. Second, the APD development budget runs on a federal fiscal year to align with the federal approval process, and therefore can and will pull from the \$19.7 million that shows in the first quarter of SFY19 during final reconciliation later this fall. Furthermore, Jamin noted that within the development categories, for the quarter ending June 30, there are a couple things to note: State personnel was a higher than average \$3.5 million, driven by payment timing with the previous quarter. Jamin noted there is typically minimal lag in the state personnel processing, so the encumbrance may look high at \$3.1 million, but the encumbrance also includes the cost of living adjustment and a month with three pay periods.

Next, Jamin advised that looking at service contracts, typically there is a lot of lag as it takes time to receive and process payments from vendors. However, there was a push to reconcile as much as reasonably possible prior to July 1, resulting in the \$6.3 million showing in the last quarter, and only about \$1.8 million remaining under estimated encumbrances. He noted that

on the far right, the estimated balance for service contracts shows a negative \$3.2 million, but other categories such as hardware/software are under.

Finally, the MNIT enterprise services costs exceed the estimated budget by about \$600,000. Jamin advised that several things happened here. First, as previously discussed, several items that used to be paid in the lines above as staff, service contracts, and hardware/software became enterprise rates, and because this transition was forecast at the agency level, they roughly estimated the impact specific to METS. Second, Jamin said that as costs were evaluated throughout the year, some expenses that previously may have been estimated under operations were determined to be attributable to development. Regarding general administration, as Jamin had mentioned previously, DHS had been working with multiple areas of the federal government to revise their occupancy cost plan. This wasn't settled until last fall, and included more than \$1 million in 2017 and 2018 that is attributable to METS development. As 2017 was closed at that point, he noted that both were attributed to this fiscal year. This newly approved allocation methodology will be used in future budgets, and his team will be able to better plan for this expense.

Jamin then moved on to operations. He noted that on a budget of \$30 million, \$22.8 million is spent, and about \$4.4 million is encumbered or estimated to be spent within this fiscal year, with about \$2.8 million, or about 9% remaining. Jamin advised that a pressure of about \$1.4 million on the state personnel line is offset by \$1.5 million remaining for staff augmentation.

In addition, Jamin noted a pressure of about \$1.8 million in MNIT central services. He noted services, including laptops and desktops, identity and access management, and electronic document management were being centralized. Jamin advised they knew this would decrease the direct personnel and non-personnel costs paid by DHS, as they were replaced by an enterprise rate-based service model, his team was still determining how this would impact the individual budget lines. They forecast and budgeted central services across the agencies of DHS and MNsure as a whole, not at the system level, and so there wasn't a good baseline specific to METS.

Greg asked when Jamin would be able to close out state fiscal year 18. Jamin advised that this data was a snapshot, but he expects most things to be closed out by the next report, with a couple things that may linger 1 to 2 more quarters.

Chuck noted that the budget work group met and had some discussion around the operations budget, where some underspending has occurred, and is working to determine what that means for the operations budget going into 2019.

MOTION: Deborah moved to approve the METS quarterly fiscal report. Janet seconded. All voting members present voted in favor and the motion was approved.

New Business

ESC Members

None.

Public Comment

None.

Adjourn

MOTION: Janet moved to adjourn. Deborah seconded. All voting members present voted in favor and the meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.