


Enrollment and Eligibility Platform RFI Results Update for July 17, 2019



Progress update: Other transitioning states

- Nevada**
 - Beginning user acceptance testing including external stakeholders, on-track for OE 2020 go-live
- New Mexico**
 - Completed RFP, vendor selected for OE 2021 implementation
- New Jersey and Pennsylvania**
 - Both formally planning to transition from full FFEs to full SBMs, and preparing for OE 2021 go-live according to governors' declaration letters

Oregon RFI overview

- Borrowed heavily from Nevada's RFI
- Closed May 31, 2019
- 2-part Request for information (RFI)
 - Part 1 – Technology Platform
 - Part 2 – Consumer Assistance Center
- Responses from 10 vendors
 - 2 for Part 1 only
 - 4 for Part 2 only
 - 2 for both parts
 - 2 submissions were for ancillary services

Oregon RFI results

- Technological stability**
 - Technical details were substantially similar to the RFIs from NV and NM that were previously analyzed
 - Vendors now making iterative improvements to existing implementations
- Questions added specificity for Oregon**
 - Marketplace/OHP data exchange and churn management relationship
 - Level of customer assistance center agent knowledge and training
- Price depends on many variables**
 - Price depends on features and requirements
 - Without going to RFP, vendors are unable to be specific with pricing

Oregon RFI results - Technology

- Medicaid relationship and churn management**
 - Marketplace/ONE system data exchanges can benefit from added vendor functionality over Healthcare.gov
 - Improved Marketplace/ONE efficiencies still partially dependent on ability of ONE to accommodate them
- Data migration capabilities**
 - Though only one vendor had direct experience, all vendors proposed sound data migration strategies
- Ongoing improvements**
 - Automated chat bots and IVRs can save consumers time if implemented properly, as some vendors have
 - New business considerations coming out of premium payment and carrier reconciliation methodologies

Oregon RFI results – Consumer assistance center

- Staffing levels**
 - Variances between vendors for recommended staffing levels were smaller than the NV RFI, but still somewhat subjective
- Complete solutions**
 - All vendors were capable of a complete solution (CAC and supporting infrastructure)
- Adaptability**
 - CAC-only respondents flexible to adapt to any technology solution, but are not QHP-dedicated
- Oregon Specificity**
 - As with the technology submissions, some vendors added additional context and rationale narratives
 - Some vendors illustrated deeper understanding of Oregon mission and value priorities

Oregon RFI Results - Takeaways

- Vendor Competition**
 - Competitive market gives Oregon options
- Proven Technology Success**
 - Available, proven technology can already do far more than Oregon would initially seek, and will only improve over time
- To bundle, or not to bundle?**
 - Separate technology and service center contracts require more complex project planning and ongoing operations considerations
 - A CAC of acceptable agent quality requires the correct evaluation criteria and service-level agreements

Value propositions for an Oregon switch to a full SBM - Benefits

Oregon control: enrollment, customer service, operationalizing state health policy initiatives

- Public option or Medicaid buy-in via exchange
- Premium assistance programs (like COFA)
- Ownership of data
- Length of open enrollment periods
- Complex case resolution

Value propositions for an Oregon switch to a full SBM - Benefits

Cost predictability

Stakeholder Benefits

- Carriers, agents, assisters, other agencies
- Improved communication and resolution times for consumer issues
- Dedicated portals and consumer assistance tools
- Ability to quickly implement improvements and solutions for stakeholder issues

Value propositions for an Oregon switch to a full SBM - Risks

Risk	Mitigations
Technology Failure (or prospect of failure)	Deliverables-based contract, project gate checkpoints, requirement for vendor to have previous implementation, QA transparency
Scope creep	Strict change control process, deliverables-based contract boundaries, roadmap/progression path, QA transparency
Changes to federal laws, rules, and policies	Maintain collaborative relationships with other SBMs for mutual support, propose and support state-level legislative solutions
Uncertain timelines for state and federal oversight compliance	Engage as early as possible with oversight entities, establish clear road map and confirm progress periodically, consider contracted PMO to manage requirements

Value propositions for an Oregon switch to a full SBM - Costs

- Spending limited legislatively approved budget and activities until changes are formally requested
- Carriers pay FFM fee directly
- Required staffing changes for the Marketplace
- Pre-RFP development and contracting costs
 - Services from other state agencies (Procurement, DOJ, OSCIO)
 - Consultants and quality assurance (QA) contractors
 - Some consulting grants may be available through interested non-profits (RWJ State Network, etc.)

Value propositions for an Oregon switch to a full SBM - Costs

Vendor flexibility and options

- Willing to work around state budget cycles
- Can adjust features for affordability

Affordability

- External consumer assistance center savings for state implementation
- Predictable costs with transparent accounting
- Single Marketplace assessment for insurers
- Projected lower overall costs with improved outcomes for consumers and stakeholders

Next steps – Evaluation criteria



Principles for considering a switch (from MAC's previous conversations)

- Improved outcomes and service for Oregonians
- Better alignment with statutory intended purpose
- Ownership of, and accountability for, Oregon Marketplace enrollment and related metrics data
- Lower overall costs

13

Next steps – Timelines



Estimated time from RFP to OE readiness is 18 months, according to vendors

Time to RFP is difficult to predict, dependent on:

- Stakeholder reception and conversion
- Legislative approval, including LFO
- State and federal oversight requirements
- Milestone completion dates relative to dates for both OE and state budget cycle. Example: An RFP completed after June or July would likely change "next year" to "year after next"

14

Next steps – Marketplace efforts already in progress



More detailed estimates

- Early indicators of cost savings justify further fiscal and staffing estimates for a switch

Stakeholder engagement

- Discussions with stakeholders through existing communications channels – carriers, agents

Business case

- Cumulative results of any preliminary analyses can become part of business case with added context

Observe other state efforts

- Successes and lessons learned from other state transition efforts in progress can be captured for supporting documents

Next steps



Discussion

- What have we not addressed for the committee?
- What would the committee like to see happen next?
- Requests for next advisory meeting

16