

## MCE Gainwell Monthly Technical Meeting

### Meeting Details

Meeting Name: MCE Gainwell Monthly Technical Meeting

Leader/Facilitator: Dennis Dowling, FSSA; Rebecca Siewert, Gainwell

Location, Date and Time: Monday, July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2021; 2:00 PM; webex

Scribe: Michael Simms

<b>Attendees</b>				
<b>Anthem</b>		<b>State</b>		<b>Gainwell</b>
Gretchen Atkins		Meredith Edwards		Rebecca Young
Jean Caster		Nonis Spinner		Rebecca Siewert
Tracy Silvers	✓	Angela Todd		Bill Anderson
Jason Adams	✓	Ralph Jones		Sharon Ricketts
Tuan Nguyen	✓	Dennis Dowling	✓	Wanda Williams
LaDawna Richmond	✓	Stephanie Guetig		Stephanie Cari
Cynthia Bell		Keena Baumer	✓	Karen Grays
Trang Cooley		Scott Runner		Maksat Abamov
Tracey Welch		Craig Nielsen		Denise Brown
Ferdinand Cajigal		Mark Wiley		Xenia Hastings
Ron Stoughton		Daneida Dooley		Jerry Heady
Stephen Egan		Natalie Angel		Rubi Multani
Amy Tate		Tamra Mitchell	✓	Beth Linginfelter
Maura Wenglarz		Maria Schelli-Merrifield		Ginger Brophy
Cindy Riley		Shawna Frazier		Joyce Lee
<b>MHS</b>		Kathleen Leonard		Tisha Arberry
Geoff Petrie		Susan Beecher		Angela Tynes
Brett Norris	✓	Ryan Callahan		Melinda Kent
Taylor Fulner		Megan Anderson		KC Sushant
Kumar Aggala		Colin Woods		Nastassja Daniel
Stoshala Payne		Shannon Effler		Greg Hershberger
Anastasia Spurgetis		Paul Fruits		Greg Zimmerer
Chelsea Trotter		<b>CareSource</b>		LaKisha Browder
Monica Johnson		Trish Kappes	✓	<b>Optum</b>
William Wilson	✓	Samantha Walton		Harini Kasamsetty
Melissa Steever		Lindsay McGuire		Harsha Jasti
<b>MDwise</b>		Jeff Severino	✓	<b>Maximus</b>
Jason Thacker		Kristina Vanbelkum		NaKeita Boyd
Michelle Okeson	✓	Lindsay Young		Jennifer Haas
Raeann Brown	✓	David Rose		<b>HMA</b>
Brian Arrowood		Akbar Shareef		Kaitlyn Feiock
Marcia Shively		Gary Ziegler		<b>UHC</b>
Bonnie Kegin		Resalot Taus		Kavitha Thomas
Jim Matthews		Chelsi Hall		Elizabeth Adams
		Jeffrey Kardatzke		
JEDavis	✓	VPatel	✓	

## Agenda Items

Item	Topic	Facilitator	Notes (conclusions, discussions, decisions, and next steps)
1	Open Meeting	Dennis	<p>Review past action items and update statuses</p> <p>November Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gretchen: Seeking feedback from State on what trends we expect moving forward (for instance, trending down with unemployment? Etc.)</li> <li>Natalie: No official estimates, but we don't have a lot of new Medicaid applications</li> <li>Meredith: Further growth not anticipated, working toward projection of any membership changes in other direction</li> </ul> <p>December Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further questions</li> </ul> <p>January Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dennis: Continue through PHE, which is likely to extend through 2021</li> <li>Jeff: Is there a new category for HIP?</li> <li>Nonis: No, it's an existing one.</li> <li>Gretchen: Is cost share distinct from PHE?</li> <li>Nonis: Now intertwined.</li> </ul> <p>February Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nonis: Provided update on evolving PHE landscape and guidance.</li> </ul> <p>March Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keena: No update</li> </ul> <p>April Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meredith: Official extension, but can only do every 90 days, but informally expect to be extended through end of 2021.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nonis: No update</li> </ul>
3	Post-PHE Operations MCE Test Plans	Angela Todd (Meredith Edwards, Kaitlyn Feiock)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCEs to provide OMPP with a list of processes each will need to test before resuming normal operations post PHE. Include timelines for testing, test files needed, and other system engagement.</li> </ul> <p>May Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meredith: Brainstorm what MCEs need</li> <li>Gretchen: Ensure Payment files are moving, HIP files in general (Particularly potential plus), Members 66+, etc.</li> <li>Kavitha: Whole Cost Share</li> <li>Bill: Agree with Anthem, also how Medically Frail moves back in</li> </ul> <p>June Meeting: Requests from Anthem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will the potential plus process happen after COVID? Will there be phases and how does that work?</li> <li>How will open applications be handled? We would like the state to consider terming all open applications with a current term date and start fresh with a current applications. (we prefer no retro term dates)</li> <li>Confirm Testing Items Received</li> </ul> <p>June Meeting:</p>

- Gretchen: When are we beginning?
- Angela: Digesting these and coordinating with all systems/schedules
- Kaitlyn: Sooner rather than later (roughly 60-90 days) to start testing
- Kaitlyn: Everybody left in basic will have a potential plus applied to them.
- Kaitlyn: Applications after will be handled like pre-COVID.
- Nonis: We will start sending out to individuals to give opportunity to report any changes, still no negative actions as a result yet.

July Meeting:

- Rebecca: working with the state to roll some items back.
- Meredith: I do not have a timeline yet.

- CareSource is interested how/if the state meeting the CMS Interoperability requirements for the fee for service population. Is there public information available on a web site we can review?

January Meeting:

- Craig: We have analyzed, but no decision, we have also received the next wave rule and are analyzing it as well.

February Meeting:

- Craig: No update on state decision; next wave rule suspended before being published in Federal Register

March Meeting:

- Craig: No update and no decision, thus not on trajectory for 7/1/21; May ask MCEs for their details if and when CMS requests

April Meeting:

- Craig: Will not make July 1, 2021
- Jeff: CareSource: Yes, were close to ready on 4/1, some pieces released, more to come.

May Meeting: No Update

June Meeting:

- Kavitha: We plan to be ready for 7/1, there are a couple of things we will be seeking approval on portal language and will reach out.
- MDwise: On Track
- CareSource: On Track
- MHS: No response
- Anthem: Been testing; will follow up

July Meeting:

- Kavitha: I will follow-up on this
- MSWise: No update
- Jeff: No update, currently working with a vendor does the state have any update?
- Dennis: planning for the 1<sup>st</sup> of the year.
- Jeff: I am comfortable with closing. Any additional information from the state would help.
- Anthum Jason: we are compliant as of 7/1
- Jason/Kavitha: I can confirm, this can be closed.

4 CMS Interoperability Jeff Severino

---

5	59372 - Encounters for FQHC and RHC's	Jason Adams	<p>February Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jason: Implementation date/timeframe/project plan</li> </ul> <p>March Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greg: Work will be complete end of month, request currently being evaluated to delay effectiveness to July</li> <li>• Question: What are the three CRs, and is Dental a 7/1 implementation?</li> <li>• Greg: Main CR is 59372, another is for an enhancement, and a third is for dental. Dental is not a 7/1 implementation date, but with delay to effectiveness of other, may pull into July by doubtful.</li> </ul> <p>April Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greg: Small enhancements being approved by state and decided when that will go live; tentatively scheduled for July (Medical); change control for that may not go live with it; August for Dental</li> </ul> <p>May Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dennis: Still scheduled for July</li> </ul> <p>June Meeting Request from Anthem: Planned July 28 go-live on target? Dental Vendors requirements or design document (project GT-2638)?</p> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger/Rebecca: Will follow up with Dave Murphy</li> <li>• Scott: As far as I know, 7/1 for Medical and Behavior health is still happening; Dental may still be later but retro'd back to 7/1</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greg: the dental is on track for the August implementation</li> </ul>
---	---------------------------------------	-------------	--

---

6	HCC Medworks Project update	Jason Adams	<p>February Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jason: requirements and workgroups?</li> <li>• Ginger: Updates sent 2/12/21</li> </ul> <p>March Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger: Appreciated update, moving forward</li> </ul> <p>April Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger: Moving forward</li> <li>• LaDawna: Will need to know when</li> <li>• Ginger: Expect testing in August timeframe</li> </ul> <p>May Meeting: Request updates on test-plans and timelines for December, 2021 go-live:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jason: Current timeline (mentioned may be earlier) and test files related to that</li> <li>• Meredith: Connected to PHE timing; working on test plans</li> <li>• Ginger: Working on figuring it out, no timeline quote yet</li> </ul> <p>June Meeting Request from Anthem: Requires coding changes for MCE's - possibility of a work group?</p> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger: We've had to move the release date out, had indicated August for vendor testing, will probably move out to November.</li> <li>• Kavitha: Will sample premium file take until November?</li> <li>• Ginger: We should be able to get that out earlier, maybe September.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger: the implantation date has moved out to January. Currently in SIT. The updated Business Design was sent out last month.</li> <li>• Jason: how many network member are included</li> </ul>
---	-----------------------------	-------------	--

---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nonis: a total of 3,072 members in MEDworks. 2,445 are in fee-for-service. Anthem has 431, MHS has 192, and UHC has 3.</li> <li>• Gretchen: we would like to be a part of regression testing.</li> </ul>
7	Project Distribution Lists (Emails) from MCEs	Dennis Dowling	<p>To allow the State to use to communicate project work information</p> <p>April Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger: Would use for 834 delivery report</li> <li>• Kavitha: Which team?</li> <li>• Meredith: For technical (project) team; I already have operations</li> <li>• Greg: We could use one for system (outage) issues, and one for projects.</li> </ul> <p>May Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dennis: Received from UHC</li> </ul> <p>June Meeting: Request MHS clarify Distribution List request</p> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebecca: Explained purpose</li> <li>• Ginger/Beth: CareSource and Anthem provided for projects.</li> <li>• Jason: Will send for system issues as well.</li> <li>• Trish: Sent for 834s, if meant for system outages, will need to revisit our list.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger: the defect has been moved to Model Office. Working to move into production on next Wednesday.</li> <li>• Dennis: I think we can close this one out.</li> </ul>
8	Receiving a Term on the 834 when a member has been voided	Michelle Okeson	<p>We sent examples to Gainwell and were told this is a known issue. The 834 process is not picking up retro changes when they go back into last year. This causes Core to show the member's MCE assignment to be voided however the MCE shows the member as active for the time period.</p> <p>April Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beth: The 834 challenge I was involved with were for HIP authorizations are both retro-effective and retro-ended, so sometimes 834s don't generate.</li> <li>• Jerry: Will have to do same process for MHS as Anthem</li> <li>• Michelle: We are getting an 834 on this, but the member has been voided</li> <li>• Jerry: We can identify those members and get them to you; will get with Xenia</li> <li>• Joyce: Are you not using term audit files? Send examples to me.</li> <li>• Michelle: Just getting term transaction rather than a void.</li> </ul> <p>May Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joyce: 834 audit files were not designed to generate a void in the term file, MCEs should have received a void in their daily.</li> <li>• Jerry: Awaiting direction from PMO, only get in daily if they term entire segment.</li> <li>• Joyce: If termed in January and the term was voided, we wouldn't generate it, need to revisit, maybe change 834 term audit program to pick those up.</li> <li>• Jerry: If member had assignment for whole year and got term for final six months, that would go out; later on first six months was voided, but nothing goes out and causes issues for plans; Service NOW Request # REQ0018345</li> </ul>

			<p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joyce: Submitted a CR for this issue. Will receive a void record on 834 term audit file for those members; discuss further in kick-off after CR approval as original build was to not send these out.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting Update: Dennis: this 834 Change Request is GT-7595</p> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Michelle: we currently not receiving the information on the daily file.</li> <li>Joyce: you are receiving the voids in the daily file. However, if the member is termed, you will not receive those updates in the daily. I will be scheduling the kick-off soon that will include the requirements and scenarios.</li> </ul>
9	Frail Capitation Rates	Michelle Okeson	<p>We would appreciate more information on the proposed change away from frail capitation rates. How will this be addressed through the 834s? Is testing planned? What is the timeline?</p> <p>April Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meredith: We are working on creating new capitation category codes; potential June go live.</li> </ul> <p>May Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meredith: For HIP – We’ll have expansion which will cover plus and basic and state plan only (frail); continuing to meet; hoping to provide to MCEs shortly; you’ll seeing headings have changed in new contracts; discussing if they’ll load at Gainwell prior to CMS approval.</li> <li>Joyce: New descriptions which will go out on companion guide.</li> <li>Bill: Both 834 and 820?</li> <li>Joyce: Yes, June go-live at discretion of Meredith and team.</li> <li>LaDawna: What is timeframe for companion guides?</li> <li>Max: Already submitted to EDI team for review</li> <li>Joyce: Drafts within next couple of weeks</li> </ul> <p>June Meeting: Request from CareSource to address GT-6643 (New HIP State Plan Expansion Cap Categories) concerns after seeing the requirements documents compared to discussion with state actuary about how these changes are being implemented.</p> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joyce: That one is going in end of this month.</li> <li>Sam: Trying to clarify what to expect.</li> <li>Joyce: Will send my responses to you.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joyce: this was implemented on 6/30. I will follow-up with Mark to make sure the correct files are sent out.</li> <li>Dennis: this will be close next month.</li> </ul>
10	Pregnancy Supplemental File Response – ‘E03 - PREGNANCY END DATE IS NOT PROVIDED’	Manju Nair	<p>I believe we are getting this error when we report the second pregnancy while the first MAMA never ended due to the PHE situation. (Submitted this item to Gainwell)</p> <p>(See above)</p> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kumar: We are receiving for supplemental files, not sure why we are getting this as our data matches 834s.</li> <li>Rebecca: Is related to PHE.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebecca: the initial NOP recorded there will not have an end date. Looking into logic for 834s.</li> <li>• Nonis: are the records being stopped? Keena and I will look into.</li> </ul>
11	Pregnancy Supplemental File Response – E04 - PREGNANCY DUE DATE MISMATCH BETWEEN IEDSS AND CORE MMIS	Manju Nair	<p>Not sure why we are getting this error. (Submitted this item to Gainwell) (See above)</p> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joyce: We don't get delivery date from IEDSS; I will take a look to see why they're hitting, if MCEs have current examples please send.</li> <li>• Rebecca: Check with Maksat, may have been working on these.</li> <li>• LaKisha: From Kari.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dennis: this item will be closed.</li> </ul>
12	T-MSIS Data Quality Issue	Harsha Jasti	<p>We have a data quality issue with TMSIS that seems to be related to "too many" ancillary revenue codes on inpatient claims. FFS reimbursement methodology primarily reimburses inpatient claims based on DRG, we are seeking confirmation from the MCE's that they submit inpatient encounters to Indiana Medicaid with a reimbursement methodology based on DRG as well. Or, are they in fact based on revenue codes submitted?</p> <p>We would like to know if MCOs have a reimbursement methodology similar to Indiana's Fee For Service inpatient claims which is a DRG based reimbursement methodology (screen shot and link below). Do all MCE's submit inpatient encounters by the same reimbursement arrangement?</p> <p>The link to the inpatient hospital services module:  <a href="https://www.in.gov/medicaid/files/inpatient%20hospital%20services.pdf">https://www.in.gov/medicaid/files/inpatient%20hospital%20services.pdf</a></p> <p>May Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ralph: Seeing some odd things in T-MSIS data, MCEs can respond via email if preferred to confirm if they're doing reimbursement for inpatient claims via DRG; also would like to know if reimbursement methodology is similar to FFS claims.</li> <li>• Stephanie: Trying to correctly respond to CMS that reimbursement is via DRG and not revenue code.</li> </ul> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ralph: Received from CareSource.</li> <li>• Craig: Anthem and MHS as well.</li> <li>• Kavitha: Will send.</li> </ul> <p>July Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nonis: no updates</li> </ul>
13	List of IEDSS Defects Affecting Eligibility	Michelle Okeson	<p>Could these be shared with MCEs? We run into issues with eligibility and are told that they are due to known IEDSS issues. It would be helpful to know what to look for. (An example is mid-month terms due to IEDSS only sending the future segment to Gainwell. It causes a gap in eligibility for the member.)</p> <p>June Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ginger: We do still occasionally get this example were IEDSS where IEDSS doesn't send the current eligibility segment with future or retro; causes Core to close down the BP. Then a few days later will get a new current segment, but BP doesn't always reopen.</li> </ul>

- Keena: IEDSS is working on this, put in a fix last week or today; two more fixes to go into effect in September to fix this; we are fixing as found in the interim.
- RaeAnn: Can this be shared before we discover these independently?
- Keena: I can get with IEDSS and Nonis and we can get to you.

July Meeting:

- Nonis: we are tracking the defects monthly.
- Keena: 217895- no gender is being indicated. Currently working to fix the gender.
- 218783 – Working to change the file.
- 216854 – Talked with Angie about this defect last week. The conformation date should be the date to act on.
- 219171 – The date of death is being corrected.
- 219126 – their acting on the record
- 219216 – Because of the Public Health Emergency, Keena is looking into this with IEDSS.
- Ginger: the CDE files are not in the proper format, as a result the files are not processing correct. I will provide examples.

Could these be shared with MCEs? (For example, retro NEMT assignments that must be overwritten.) It would be helpful to know what the issues are and how they are being addressed.

June Meeting:

- Raeann: Can these known manual corrections be shared as well?
- Ginger: By Gainwell or IEDSS? Will need to check with Business Unit.
- Raeann: This example Gainwell.
- Rebecca: We fix as we find, might not be a list per se, but can talk internally with team.
- Mark W.: Are these defects?
- Rebecca: Often one-offs.

July Meeting:

- Rebecca: currently working with Kenna and team to resolve the list. I will forward list to Michelle Okeson and team.

14 List of Issues requiring Manual Correction by Gainwell Managed Care Michelle Okeson

Medicaid vs Medicare

June Meeting:

- Jason: Is there a difference in rules between Medicaid and Medicare, and if so, what are those?
- Tracy: We know there's a difference, Medicare asks for Billing Address; State asks for Service Location.
- Rebecca Y.: Confirm Tracy; we require Service Location.
- Tracy: We won't make a one-to-one match then because of this difference; will pay and be sending encounters as received from Medicare; if it fails your validation it will be reported on 277U, which we don't always get in a timely manner.
- Rebecca: 277U issue wasn't on your side, was on our side, still working Mid-March (17<sup>th</sup>) one. We will report those Box 33 errors back. I don't know if it would factor into rates.
- Dennis: Don't know either, will need to leave open.

15 COBA Box 33 billing rules Jason Adams



			July Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jason: I am not sure that we have a solution.</li> <li>• Rebecca: I will follow-up with Rebecca.</li> </ul>
16	Outage	Jeff Severino	Jeff: In future communications, could you specify what the impacts to the MCEs would be and what the 'catch-up' plan is? Gretchen: Crucial to our processing, got empty files, any way to know when files are being combined would be helpful. Dennis:
17	Month-End Files	Michelle Okeson	Can Gainwell please explain what happened with the month-end files this month? Why were so many records excluded from the daily and audit files? What is being done to ensure this does not happen again?  Joyce: I wrote up an issue for this one and forwarded to the project sponsor. Eligibility indicator is not processing correctly due to some code updates in June. The 834s have been corrected. Michelle: this also occurred in May. We did not receive all of the records we were anticipating in July. Ginger: we have corrected so the jobs do not overlap. This was a timing issue, which has been resolved. This item can be closed.
<b>NOTE: The State will be working remotely starting 3/17/2020 following Gov. Holcomb's directive in efforts to slow down the spread of COVID 19. All meetings and business operations will be continued as scheduled.</b>			

#### Action Items

Item	Assigned To:	Due Date	Description	Status
1.	MCEs	5/17/21	Send distribution lists (potentially one for technical operations and one for projects) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sent by UHC 5/10/21</li> <li>• Sent by MDwise 5/20/21</li> <li>• Sent by Anthem 6/3/21 and 6/18 (Projects)</li> <li>• MHS 834 DL addition shared by Gainwell 6/14/21; full list sent by MHS on 6/17/21; Systems and Project DLs sent 6/22/21</li> <li>• Ginger/Beth 6/21: CareSource provided for projects.</li> <li>• Dennis: this item can be closed.</li> </ul>	Open
2.	MCEs	6/21/21	Send response if MCEs reimburse inpatient by DRG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sent (confirmed) by CareSource 5/18/21</li> <li>• Sent by Anthem 6/3/21</li> <li>• Sent (confirmed) by MHS 6/17/21</li> <li>• Sent by UHC 6/21/21</li> <li>• Sent by MDwise on 7/8/21</li> <li>• Dennis: this can be closed.</li> </ul>	Open
3.	Joyce	7/19/21	Send responses on GT-6643 (New HIP State Plan Expansion Cap Categories) questions to Sam Joyce: I have sent all of the responses. Dennis: this item can be closed.	Open

## Action Items

Item	Assigned To:	Due Date	Description	Status
4.	Keena	7/19/21	Get with IEDSS and Nonis and we can get list of IEDSS Defects Affecting Eligibility to MCEs Dennis: this item can be closed.	Open
5.	Rebecca Young	7/19/21	Research and respond on impact of Encounters using Medicare Billing Address in Box 33 Dennis: this item can be closed.	Open
6.	Greg Zimmerer	7/19/21	Include specific relevant impacts in outage notifications to MCEs and plan to 'catch-up' (multiple days in next file, etc.) Dennis: this item can be closed.	Open

## COVID Updates

### COVID-19

#### COVID-19 Rollback Projects

**Prior Auth** – Requested for implementation on Aug 1<sup>st</sup> 2021. This primarily involves a significant amount of Reference updates. At this time, we believe these can complete by Aug 1<sup>st</sup>. Analysis of the impact to Operations continues, to understand the impact to staffing and KPMs.

**7/19/2021** – Greg anticipating an 8/1 implementation.

**Other Reference Rollback** – Gainwell is working with the State Sponsor to understand which of the Reference updates will be rolled back and the timing. Analysis continues, evaluating staffing, Call Center, and possible KPM impacts.

**7/19/2021** – the roll-back efforts are currently underway.

**Provider Enrollment** – The rollback will involve addressing 18 months of pent-up revalidations and recertifications, and analysis continues to understand the impact to staffing and KPMs as well as the time needed to address these. Systems updates will complete by Sept 1<sup>st</sup>, rolling back to the pre-COVID state in Portal and letters.

#### COVID-19 PHE Efforts Continuing Include:

**Premium Vendor - Halt Premium Payment** – This project prevents accounts closing for members who are unable to make their premium payment during COVID19. Gainwell continues to apply payments daily for incoming conditional members for CHIP and MED Works. Credits will be given for August monthly vouchers after the Adverse Action day (07/15). This project will complete at the direction of the State.

**Eligibility Re-Opens/CoPay/CostShare** - We continue to identify and extend Medicaid Eligibility as requested by the State.

Finding ID	Creation Date	Severity	Priority	Title	Description	State	MO Planned Date	MO Actual Date	Prod Planned Date	Prod Actual Date	Current Status
19094	2021-07-08	2-Major: No Workaround	0 - Critical	<b>834s are not generated for non-medically frail/new members - GT-6643</b>	Description: Missed requirement for CR GT-6643 caused 834s for non-medically frail and new members to not be generated Impact: 834s are not going out for 90% of members Workaround: As the members are identified, the Cap category demographic data is updated and 834s generated.	Open	2021-07-15				Emergency break fix going to Prod override on 7/13/21. Will be regression tested in MO on 7/15/21. 7/19/21 – Coding is completed however, the effect is still open.
19079	2021-06-22	2-Major: No Workaround	1 - High	<b>PRF Capitation Reconciliation when the record is a Void</b>	Description: The current PRF Capitation Recon Logic is using the same validation process when validating Final and Void PRF records. Void records should not be validated during the PRF Capitation Recon process, they should automatically be reversed and loaded. Impact: Voided PRF records are not being recouped during Capitation. Workaround: An SE is required to manually calculates and loaded the Voided record for recouping. This takes hours to complete.	MO Implemented	2021-06-29	2021-06-29			Testing is in process and waiting for the Cap cycle to run on 7/21. 7/19/2021 – currently testing anticipating implementing next week.