

Minnesota Eligibility Technology System Executive Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Details

- May 22, 2018
- 10 a.m. - 12 p.m.
- Room 1100, Minnesota Senate Building, 95 University Ave W, St. Paul, MN 55155

Participants

Voting Members

- Janet Goligowski, Stearns County - present via phone
- Deborah Huskins, Hennepin County - present
- Chuck Johnson, DHS - present
- Kari Koob, MNSure - present via phone
- Nathan Moracco, DHS - present
- Nate Clark, MNSure - present

Non-Voting Members

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

Guests

- Lisa Koenig, MNIT
- Jamin Johnson, MNIT
- Stephanie Grisell, MNSure

Agenda Items

Call to Order & Welcome

Chuck Johnson, DHS

Chuck Johnson, co-chair, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. He welcomed Nate Clark, acting CEO of MNSure, to the ESC.

Administrative Items

ESC Members

MOTION: Deborah Huskins moved to approve the draft [April 3, 2018 meeting minutes](#). Nathan Moracco seconded. All voting members present voted in favor and the motion was approved.

METS IT Program Status Update

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

Lisa Koenig of MNIT presented the [ESC Program Update](#).

Lisa reviewed the spring release deployment, which was released on April 7 and 8, 2018. The spring release included the following projects: MMIS Interface, notice updates, the reasonable opportunity period (ROP), DEED for renewals and defect fixes.

Chuck asked if adding DEED renewals changed the auto-renewal rate. Lisa noted that first batches of the DEED renewal have not been completed, but she would follow up when there was additional information available.

Lisa reviewed the summer release, which included large product upgrades crucial to the METS platform: the annual Cúram upgrade, an EngagePoint upgrade, and Oracle and Cloudera upgrades. The summer release will deploy one defect fix related to a Periodic Data Matching (PDM) issue and there will be continuing work on the Carrier Integration Project. The Carrier Integration Project is planning to resolve a total of eight defects related to enrollment system of record (ESOR).

Lisa provided the committee members an update on deployments for the fall release. The fall release will deploy the 2019 Marketplace Setup functionality, which prepares METS for the annual open enrollment scheduled to begin November 1, 2018. The fall release will also include continued work on the MMIS Interface project, including final parts of the redesign, and the MMIS Interface project that will focus on continuing to support MNsure business activities involving enrollment. There will also be notice and defect work included in the deployment. Nathan asked for clarification on the notice work being completed and if it was DHS-specific or general notice work. Lisa did not have a complete answer and indicated she would follow up.

The fall release will also include the Reasonable Opportunity Period (ROP) Renewals defect work. Lisa noted space was held in the fall release for defect fixes related to the deployment of the ROP renewals, and the four defects have been prioritized and are slated to be corrected in the fall release. Finally, Lisa indicated the ROP Phase 2 and PRISM Interface projects have been de-scoped from the fall release.

Deborah asked Lisa for additional details on the MMIS Interface project, including functionality and what to expect with the impending release. Lisa did not have additional details on what functionality will be different and deferred to Greg Poehling, ESC co-chair. Greg clarified the project will include the final piece of the major redesign efforts, which will speed up the process and make the process more accurate. Deborah asked an agenda item be added to the next ESC meeting to review the MMIS Interface project. Nathan asked for further context around the impact of the project from MNIT. He was not concerned about projected

or actual results, but wanted examples of how the system has improved. Janet Goligowski asked about the release roadmap and raised a concern that 20% defect work is not being completed in the summer release. Lisa indicated she would follow up with Janet.

Lisa continued by reviewing projects expected to be deployed in the winter release. She mentioned that the ROP Phase 2 and PRISM Interface projects are expected to be in the winter release, but work is ongoing and MNIT has not yet committed to including these projects in the release. Other projects included in the winter release include work on the MMIS Interface project, notice and defect work, and the Federal Tax Information (FTI) renewals project. The FTI project is a two-phase project aimed at safeguarding FTI from unauthorized access or disclosure.

Lisa noted Program Management Team (PMT) is beginning the 2019 METS Roadmap planning process, aligning with the kickoff of the federal advance planning document (APD) process. Nathan asked Lisa to project when the ESC could review the 2019 METS Roadmap. Lisa indicated she was unsure, but noted the APDs have to be submitted by July 31, 2018 for review, so potentially shortly thereafter. Deborah acknowledged the unique person ID project slated for 2018 project work and requested additional information about the project.

Lisa provided the committee with project updates, which included updates on the ROP Phase 2 and PRISM Interface. Lisa explained most of the scope for ROP Phase 2 was removed from the fall release due to the project needing a longer testing runway. The PMT recognized the ROP Phase 2 project as a priority and approved a “proof of concept” approach that will deliver ROP Phase 2 in either the coming winter release or the 2019 spring release. Lisa took a moment to clarify the “proof of concept” approach, noting this approach inserts a new layer of testing into the process that allowed the PMT to separate functional testing from overall integration. By decoupling these two types of testing, the PMT can ensure projects get the full amount of functional testing needed before it is committed to a specific release, and before the code is comingled. Chuck asked for Lisa to clarify the term further, in simpler terms. He noted he understood the “proof of concept” approach is essentially breaking up testing so things can be done in parallel. Lisa agreed with this definition and also noted the concept will decrease the amount of defects.

Lisa reported that the PRISM Interface Iteration 3 project was de-scoped from the fall release because additional time was needed to determine the preferred, enterprise-level approach. In particular, the PMT is rethinking how the system should broker PRISM data changes in METS. The PRISM project team is working to meet winter release timelines. Final scheduling will take several factors into account, including interdependencies with future phases of the ROP project, resource impacts to other projects, and availability within the testing environments.

Next, Lisa updated the committee members on the program status for all active METS projects as of May 18, 2018. She noted there are two projects in red, the ROP Phase 2 project and infrastructure improvements. Infrastructure improvements is red due to a reporting issue under the compliance and audits subproject. The PMT expects this project to be red until early fall. Lisa noted there are three projects in

yellow: MMIS interface, including redesign; GetInsured implementation; and the PRISM interface. The MMIS interface is in yellow status due to the technical requirements and design documentation which is still at risk of being delivered late. The GetInsured status is in cautionary status due to the amount of work needed to meet the contractual obligation of getting sign-on ability and connectivity between GetInsured and MNsure. Finally, the PRISM interface is in yellow due to scope concerns and resource contentions.

Finally, Lisa referred the committee members to the [Periodic Data Match Field Test Handout](#), which outlines the PMT recommendation regarding the statewide pilot of periodic data matching. The handout clarifies the METS PMT seeks ESC approval for a brief “turn-on, turn-off” PDM field test to ensure functionality before full deployment. Lisa noted this field test will not require any additional programming and will not affect development plans.

The three questions the PMT seeks to understand by this field test are:

- Is the PDM functionality operating as intended?
- Are there any current, known system issues greatly exacerbated by the PDM process?
- Do any process issues arise that were unanticipated and/or create additional, unknown manual workarounds?

Deborah noted she used the language of “field test” instead of “pilot program” following feedback she received.

MOTION: Deborah moved to approve the recommendation as stated in the Periodic Data Matching Field Test Handout. Janet seconded.

Chuck raised a concern about the “designated representatives” and their role in this project. Deborah noted county officers met with DHS previously to compile names as to who would belong in the assessment workgroup and indicated they are receiving names from MNIT soon. Deborah indicated once the assessment work group has been finalized, the group will focus on what kinds of information the group is seeking and a turnaround time on feedback.

Greg asked, would be able to take action on any decision once the assessment work group has completed their work and made a decision. He asked on behalf of MNIT so the agency can have clear guidance moving forward. Chuck added that if the assessment group found issues, there would need to be a plan for how those issues would be explained and prioritized and how PMT would be involved. Deborah noted the information gathered through this assessment process should be go back the governance structure, particularly the PMT and, if necessary, the ESC. Deborah noted she saw the purpose of the assessment workgroup as to understand what is being assessed and how that data is being collected. The assessment workgroup, in Deborah’s opinion, should not be a decision-making body. Greg asked that a member of the assessment workgroup present at the next ESC meeting.

Chuck also expressed concern about the timeline for the assessment workgroup and expressed a desire that a hard date of resolution be confirmed before voting on the resolution. Deborah noted that she is unable to provide a hard date, but the counties are not interested in

delaying the field test or the outcomes of the field test. Deborah noted a need for more details about the three questions outlined in the handout. Chuck indicated he did not need a hard date on the motion to vote but noted he would like a hard date of resolution to be confirmed before or at the next ESC meeting.

Nathan believed, upon listening to the conversation, the handout was already outdated, particularly noting the “next steps” section and the language of “if all parties agree.” He noted he would like to see an amended document before he voted on the motion. He also asked if the assessment workgroup would be acknowledging the cost of the field test and wondered where the cost of the test would be reconciled. Deborah indicated she was unsure what the language of “if all parties agree” means and looked to the PMT for clarification. However, she noted she was comfortable deleting the phrase.

Nathan asked Lisa when the first set of batches could run. Lisa indicated she did not have the batch calendar and Greg added he would not recommend viewing the batch calendar as guidance for this field test. He noted internal discussion has mentioned first batch running in November 2018.

Chuck summarized discussions and indicated there are two paths forward: one, to bring the recommendation to the next ESC meeting, having clarified the outstanding questions, and vote on the recommendation; or two, to vote on remanding the recommendation back to the PMT to review and amend based on the committee’s questions. Greg noted that MNIT does not need a vote today and also indicated that MNIT is a participant in this field test, but not the owner of this field test, associated assessment workgroup, and any related documents.

Janet agreed with the points raised by the committee members, that workload is not an evaluative factor and welcomed the idea of coming to the next ESC meeting with particular deadlines and dates in mind. Janet recommended amending the previous motion to remanding the recommendation to the PMT and the county assessment group to clarify these details and bring a more detailed proposal to the next ESC meeting.

Deborah withdrew her previous motion and offered a new motion.

MOTION: Deborah moved to remand the proposal to the PMT and the county assessment workgroup to more fully flesh out the details and respond to the questions and discussion that has occurred today. Janet seconded. All voting members present voted in favor and the motion was approved.

Greg reiterated his request to have a member of the county assessment workgroup present at the next ESC meeting.

Quarterly Financial Report

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

Jamin Johnson of MNIT provided the [ESC fiscal report](#) for the quarter ending March 31, 2018.

Jamin outlined the fiscal report but indicated the presentation would focus on budgeting for fiscal year 2019 (FY19) before reviewing the current year quarterly expenditures and annual budget.

Jamin reminded committee members that the second page of the document reviews the state budget for FY16 and FY17 as well as FY18 and FY19. Jamin noted the document was split into two parts, a development component and an operations component for each year. The development component can further be broken down into three categories: the original development, the METS eligibility and enrollment advance planning document, and finally, qualified health plan-specific development. Jamin indicated FY16 through FY18 have no changes. Jamin reported FY19 also has no changes but understanding the interdependencies and complex nature of the METS system to DHS and MNSure and the misalignment of the state and federal budget, Jamin expects the FY19 operations budget to potentially vary slightly.

In regards to the FY19 APD, DHS is preparing for the process by setting a METS development target for FY19 of about \$45 million dollars. Once this process has been completed, this target will be submitted to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) for review, with an expected completion date of October 1, 2018.

Jamin noted MNSure also invested in METS development for FY19 as it relates to the GetInsured solution. Previously, the MNSure Board had approved a preliminary development budget of \$5.3 million. Greg asked when this information would be approved by the MNSure Board and Nate confirmed the Board is expected to vote on the preliminary development budget at its July meeting.

Jamin moved on to discussing the operations budget, noting that while the budget accurately reflected the costs of FY18, there were a few categories that were over- and under-budget. Jamin noted the interdependencies, such as software licenses, of MNSure and DHS, and indicated once MNIT has a better understanding of these connections, a complete update to the FY19 budget will be completed.

Jamin continued by reviewing the FY18 quarterly report. Jamin pointed to the second-to-last column in the report, which is the estimated expenditures and encumbrances, with the last column showing the estimated balance remaining. Jamin indicated as the METS system matures, MNIT is becoming better at reflecting needs; however, fluctuations remained with the categories of state personnel staff augmentation, service contracts, hardware, software, central services, and general administration. Jamin noted the general administration is over-spent by about \$2 million, but DHS is working with the federal government to balance the costs.

Jamin reviewed the operations quarterly report and noted about \$30 million in estimated expenditures with about \$15.1 million encumbered. Jamin indicated there have been multiple fluctuations in personnel costs and infrastructure.

Chuck raised a concern about the high amount of estimated encumbrances and asked Jamin to comment. Jamin shared Chuck's concern and noted the encumbrances listed are a mix of

encumbrances according to the SWIFT system and the practical experiences of the fiscal analysts. Jamin also noted it's a timing issue as to when the agency receives a bill and pays the bill.

Greg asked how Jamin projected the encumbrance for staff augmentation. Jamin noted the goal is based on what is actually going to be spent by tying the system dollars together with reality.

MOTION: Nathan moved to approve the quarterly financial report for submission to the Legislative Oversight Committee. Kari Koob seconded. All voting members present voted in favor and the motion was approved.

New Business

ESC Members

Chuck provided the committee an update on legislative action, noting it's difficult to comment, as the Governor has not yet signed for vetoed the omnibus spending bill. Chuck noted the bill would remove \$14 million from DHS's systems fund to direct current treatment for electronic health records. Chuck indicated if the Governor signs the omnibus spending bill, there will have to be an internal re-shuffling of priorities, which could impact METS development.

Jenna Covey noted there were two items included in the spending bill that would have an impact on MNIT priorities. The first is the 3% mandate for agencies to address cybersecurity from existing budgets. The second item related to the language around the field test recommendation. Jenna also informed the committee that MNIT had been watching the language related to moving MNIT under the Department of Administration, but it was removed from consideration.

Nate indicated MNSure was watching the omnibus spending bill specifically related to the decrease to the premium withhold and a provision that would eliminate the active selector tool. However, the language around premium withhold has been eliminated from the final spending bill.

Public Comment

None.

Adjourn

Greg noted that the next METS ESC meeting is June 26, 2018.

MOTION: Deborah moved to adjourn. All voting members present voted in favor and the meeting adjourned at 11:24 a.m.