**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 rational narratives
  - Some vendors illustrated deeper understanding of Oregon mission and value priorities
### Oregon RFI Results - Takeaways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Vendor Competition</strong></th>
<th>• Competitive market gives Oregon options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proven Technology Success</strong></td>
<td>• Available, proven technology can already do far more than Oregon would initially seek, and will only improve over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To bundle, or not to bundle?</strong></td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 - Risks

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

### 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 - 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
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

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”

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