

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<b>Program / Project Management (BAI01)</b>					
<b>Program /Project Framework</b> (BAI01.1 – BAI01.2)	Project operates within a standard program and project framework and approach including workflow process with project approvals, checkpoint reviews, and periodic status reporting at project, agency, and statewide levels	None			
	Program was initiated using the RFP process with “gated” review and approval approach at governance hierarchy levels. Sponsor and steering committee were designated. A business case was developed, and plan for benefit realization was updated several times throughout the initiative, most recently indicating a payback on state investment in 9 months from implementation.	None			
<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b> (BAI01.3)	Stakeholder engagement is maintained thru regular meetings and status updates. Some stakeholders have not been identified and/or communication plans could be more robust for stakeholder’s need or level of interest.	Update communication plan for all stakeholders Measure effectiveness of communications and revise plans as needed See other communication comments in this document	IP  NS	Deen  TBD	



## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<p><b>Project Planning and Execution</b> (BAI01.7 – BAI01.8, BAI01.12)</p>	<p>Scope of each project has been defined and approved. Project phase initiation is formally approved and communicated with acceptance on deliverables from previous phases.</p> <p>An integrated schedule is developed and maintained by the vendor, CSC, for the program and its component project builds. The integrated schedule is currently being updated based on contract amendment 3 to shift the implementation date from February to July, 2013. Approval of OMMISS is required to complete the re-baselined view of the plan. Although CSC maintains the schedule, dates can be tracked against baseline, so no unapproved changes are made without OMMISS consent.</p> <p>Resources are assigned to detail project tasks thru the Integrated Project Schedule and resource capacity is tracked thru capacity and other resource reporting. Workload is discussed and balanced thru weekly vendor internal meetings among build leads.</p>	<p>None</p>			

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<p><b>Program Risk, Quality and Performance Management</b> (BAI01.9 - BAI01.11)</p>	<p>A vendor, MAXIMUS, is performing Independent Verification and Validation of the program to validate quality, in addition to the testing that is planned.</p> <p>A consultant is performing risk management functions for the program, tracking and following up on issues.</p> <p>Project performance monitoring is performed and reported to key stakeholders (e.g., progress reporting, earned value metrics of SPI – Schedule = 1.0, and CPI – Cost =0.96). Historically poor project performance began with a 2004 contract with vendor ACS that was cancelled for non-performance. The contract with current vendor (CSC) has been amended 3 times for changes: to set the initial “go live date”, to incorporate federal and state legislative changes and extend the timeline to Feb., 2013, and a final extension to Go Live on 7/1/2013. Vendor asserts they are on target for schedule and slightly under budget.</p> <p>State Auditor issued report on the Replacement MMIS Implementation (Jan. 10, 2012) indicating need for better documentation on assessment and management of schedule changes, methodology for determining vendor penalties, and monitoring of changes to design.</p>	<p>Maintain documented rationale for decisions on all significant program decisions.</p>	<p>IP</p>	<p>Sligh</p>	

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<b>Requirements Definition and Solution Design (BAI02 – BAI03)</b>					
	A new amendment to the contract with SLI Solutions is being proposed for the BPAS initiative (1 year extension, partially due to scope expansion and partially due to a design flaw)	Perform cost benefit analysis Develop and use lessons learned on future initiatives	IP	Riley	Ongoing practice
<b>Performance Management (BAI04)</b>					
	Availability and capacity elements have been incorporated in the Vendor Contract /SLA based on projected volumes, allowances for future changes, etc.  CSC vendor contract also includes penalties (based on their degree of responsibility) if the system does not implement by July 1, 2013 (Operational Start Date) and if certification is not obtained within 1 year of implementation and approved retroactively to the Operational Start Date.				

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<b>Organizational Change Enablement (BAI05)</b>					
	<p><b>[INFORMATION REDACTED PURSUANT TO NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL STATUTES 126-22 and 126-24]</b></p> <p>Providers are slow responding to re-credential letters. Additional outreach efforts have begun by CSC to get action and working thru associations (e.g., hospital assoc.). CSC In Process work is increasing as resources were shifted to outreach.</p> <p>According to the Organizational Change Plan, divisions will not identify business changes and impacts until May after attending future state workshops and readiness assessment completed. Divisions are generally optimistic about the new system and appear ready to change. The DPEs responsible for defining their business processes based on the new MMIS system and training and championing the change within their units do not yet have enough information about the target state and process modeling is not done.</p> <p>SMEs have understanding of accurate claim payment that is not documented anywhere.</p>	<p>Reinforce organizational change project with additional leadership to drive the remaining business transformation activities</p> <p>Increase communications to non-responsive providers (perhaps Press Release) balancing requests for more response with In Process workload. Consider prioritization of outreach efforts by greatest impacted providers (e.g., most claims annually)</p> <p>Increase early information sharing for target state and accelerate timeline for facilitated sessions to drive out business processes. Target completion by end of April and incorporate walkthrough of business processes and workarounds in conjunction with May mini UAT.</p> <p>Develop knowledge transfer plans</p>	<p>NS</p> <p>IP</p> <p>NS</p> <p>NS</p>	<p>TBD</p> <p>Amos</p> <p>Sligh</p> <p>Sligh</p>	

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<b>Change Management (BAI06)</b>					
	<p>Change control processes for evaluation, prioritization and authorization of changes are defined. However, some changes to the legacy platform had been communicated directly to the HP vendor resulting in a legacy system that was out of sync with the new system as designed. In addition, a soft freeze on changes to the replacement system design was implemented March, 2012 but was not maintained. Changes were continuing to the legacy MMIS which could not be applied to the new system without endangering the success of the transition and continued to widen the gap between old and new functionality on Day 1.</p> <p>There are outstanding questions about policy direction stemming from the administration change.</p>	<p>Stop changes to legacy platform</p> <p>Develop exception process</p> <p>Approve exceptions to the stop order</p> <p>Update / define prioritization process and roles</p> <p>Slot other changes into future releases</p> <p>Itemize Legacy vs. Day 1 differences</p> <p>Identify those affected by differences</p> <p>Communicate expected differences</p> <p>Develop workarounds for changes that won't be completed before July 1 and quantify impacts (e.g., backlog of manual pricing until codes are added)</p> <p>Clarify overall policy direction</p>	<p>C</p> <p>C</p> <p>C</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p> <p>NS</p> <p>NS</p> <p>IP</p> <p>NS</p>	<p>Landman</p> <p>Landman</p> <p>Johnson</p> <p>Johnson/ Work-around team</p> <p>Wos</p>	

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
----------------	--------------	------------------------	--------	--------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Testing and Implementation (BAI107)</b>					
<b>Overall Implementation Strategy</b> (BAI07.01 - BAI07.02)	<p>Overall implementation approach has been developed that include system and data conversion, communications, training. Pre-conversion plan calls for early provider Enrollment, Verification and Credentialing (EVC), followed by conversion implementation for Day 1, and scheduled releases about every 90 days thereafter. Full functionality is expected around Jan, 2014.</p> <p>Historical data conversion begins April 29<sup>th</sup> and will be complete and verified well before July 1. Risk is that in the unlikely case that May mini-UAT identifies some problem affecting historical data, data would have to be reconverted or transactional updates built and applied to the converted files.</p> <p>Planning for conversion of business processes is still underway, including documentation of work arounds for system changes that will not go in by July 1.</p>	Perform assessment of Day 1 Benefits and Risks, and high level implications of a delay	IP	Young	

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<p><b>Test Planning and Execution</b> (BAI07.03 – BAI07.05)</p>	<p>A test plan has been developed that includes performance, security, end to end, user testing, user interface (UI) and reporting elements. Test cases have been developed by subject matter experts and results and defects are recorded in the testing system SILK. There are clear criteria for severity levels and a defect review board has been formed for severity and resolution decisions. UAT exit criteria has been established of 0 Sev 1 defects, &lt;10% Sev 2 defects and &lt;25% of Sev 3 defects plus a workoff plan accepted by the state.</p> <p>Testing has been compressed significantly. Many of the issues open for some time are more complex and require data cleanup from the legacy system. Defects for DMH in 88% of test cases initially, improved to greater than 80% pass by January 31. DMA indicates defect resolution has been within SLAs 60% and not far outside service level in the other 40%. UAT was allowed to continue into End to End testing timeframe but DMA staff have found it hard to dedicate time to testing ad-hoc interactive testing (beyond the scripts) due to short UAT timeframe, day jobs, and travel time to the test lab where they have to perform their testing. Mini-UAT in May will allow additional time. Any defects then would have to be fixed in a month however. It should be noted that lack of sufficient involvement in the testing cycles by the users can influence decisions related to certification should any defects be found at a later point.</p> <p>Testing payment accuracy could not be validated independently using documentation. SMEs were required to confirm validity of 30 payments tested.</p>	<p>Ensure focus remains on timing and duration of test cycles Develop and monitor plans regarding expected defect resolution progress</p> <p>It is critical for DMA staff to be freed up to do more extensive interactive testing thru Feb. 22 and in the May timeframe.</p> <p>Incorporate division user process walkthroughs during mini-UAT to assess business process design and interaction with the system processes and reporting.</p> <p>Ensure division users are comfortable with degree of testing, defect closures, and critical report content.</p> <p>Develop retention plans for SMEs</p>	<p></p> <p>IP</p> <p>NS</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p>	<p></p> <p>Wos/ Division Directors</p> <p>DPEs</p> <p>Guthery</p> <p>Sligh</p>	<p>Obtain more details on test environments and promotion process</p>

## MMIS Program Risk Report Detail

Area of Review	Observations	Action Recommendations	Status	Action Owner	Actions, Additional Review, Questions
<b>Conversion and Post Implementation</b> (BAI07.06 –BAI07.08)	The conversion plan calls for a command center/war room to manage the process and resolve problems. Call center staffing will also be increased to anticipate additional volume of calls from providers, etc.	Conduct a pre-implementation readiness assessment including preparedness of providers, division users, and call center staff.	NS	TBD	
	Certification is planned to occur between 6-12 months after Day 1, which in line with CMS expectations. OMMISS is hoping to hire someone who has been thru certification before to lead this effort.	Perform a dress rehearsal for the certification internally before the CMS certification team comes in. Also, ensure that sufficient user testing has occurred to demonstrate the state's commitment to this effort.	NS	Ham	

Legend

- C= Complete
- IP=In Progress
- P=Planned

Gray shaded boxes represent sections of the process framework that were not reviewed in detail due to focus on go-forward plan.