

ISSUES	DESCRIPTION	EFFECTS/IMPACTS	POTENTIAL SOLUTION(S)	RECOMMENDATION
1. Contract Related	DHS/OHA feels that it is being asked to do things related to the hiring of a QC and IV&V vendor that, while legal from a State of Oregon perspective, may not be legal according to federal laws, rules, and regulations. Note: Previous State CIO requested and received DOJ Counsel review of the FAR and the Opportunity Notice originally issued for HIX – IT QA. DOJ advised that, in its opinion, the FAR did not apply and/or in this case prohibit the hiring of this specific vendor to perform both QA and QC/IV&V. This was discussed in an October 2012 meeting with OHA (Carolyn/Suzanne Hoffman) and irrespective of DOJ’s assessment, we agreed that the primary objective was to get QC/IV&V on board and would support hiring of an alternative contractor through the Statewide QA Services Contract.			Allow DHS/OHA to hire a vendor other than Maximus to conduct QC and IV&V work on the DHS/OHA HIX IT Project. Note: This was agreed to in an October 2012 meeting. The issue has been resolved. 2/21/13 meeting all agreed this is resolved
2. Quality Assurance Related				
a. Single Versus Separate QA Vendors	Should we have a separate QA vendor for CoverOregon and HIX IT (DHS/OHA)? Gartner Group has provided “best practices” advice that either a single QA vendor, or separate QA vendors, for a multi-faceted project can be made to work.	Cost – May be more expensive as QA contractor rates vary by firm Duplication of work – Would require some re-do of work already performed by Maximus Time – Would take time for another contractor to come up to speed	Continue with current arrangement – Maximus serving as QA for CoverOregon and HIX-IT Separate QA engagements. Hire separate QA contractor for either HIX-IT or CoverOregon.	Due to the late state of the current single QA vendor approach for the HIX Program, and the limited value in having separate QA vendors (versus a single one), the current single QA environment should be maintained.
b. Validity of Maximus Findings	DHS/OHA often disagrees with Maximus findings, but is not timely in responding to the reports with its concerns. At times, there is a disconnect between what the technical DHS/OHA technical management staff view as an acceptable report and that of the DHS/OHA CIO’s office.	Delay in timely completion of QA reports – inhibits transparency on project status. Delays agency, DAS CIO, LFO understanding of issues/risks and creates a progressive barrier to timely agency implementation of risk mitigation recommendations as delay in report approval continues.	Define a clear QA Report review cycle. Have DHS/OHA better coordinate their review of the Maximus reports with the DHS CIO’s office. Change the org reporting structure for Maximus. Clarify in writing the process for dealing with “disagreements” with QA findings.	2/21/13 All agreed with recommendation
c. Lack of a Defined Timely QA Report Review Cycle	Maximus reports are not consistently being review in a timely manner by DHS/OHA, and there appears to be disconnects to what is		Define a clear QA Report review cycle (including clearly defined review timelines/deadlines). Need for	See next item

ISSUES	DESCRIPTION	EFFECTS/IMPACTS	POTENTIAL SOLUTION(S)	RECOMMENDATION
	acceptable to DHS/OHA technical management staff and the DHS/OHA CIO's office.		coordination between DHS/OHA technical management staff with the DHS/OHA CIO during the process for review and comments.	
d. Lack of timely DHS/OHA reviews and comments on QA reports	Need to comply with contractually stated timeframe for review and comments (a few business days – not weeks).		Define a clear QA Report review cycle (including clearly defined review timelines/deadlines). Re-educate all involved parties on the contractual review timeframes/deadlines.	2/21/13 all agreed. DAS CIOs to coordinate process definition and education
e. Timeliness of QA Payments to Maximus from DHS/OHA	Payments to Maximus are not always made on a timely basis. This gives the impression to Maximus that they are potentially being retaliated against for what they put into their reports to DHS/OHA. There is a need to comply with contractually stated timeframe for review and comments (a few business days – not weeks).		comply with contractually stated timeframe for review and comments	2/21/13 all agreed. 2/28- discuss with Maximus
f. Perception of DHS/OHA Intimidation/Retaliation of Maximus	DHS/OHA is taking too long to respond to Maximus QA findings, there appears to be some insistence that changes be made to the report that Maximus cannot/will not make. Failure of DHS/OHA expressing professional differences of opinion through the formal agency response vs. disapproval of QA report for technical contents or payment.		Define a clear and timely QA report review cycle and a formal process for DHS/OHA to issue a management response to each QA report	2/21/13 all agreed that Maximus must be allowed to do its job without unwarranted interference, fear, or intimidation.
g. Perception of Maximus Retaliation on DHS/OHA	DHS/OHA feel that Maximus potentially retaliates for decisions made by DHS/OHA and/or comments that Maximus puts into its reports that DHS/OHA doesn't agree with.		Define a clear and timely QA report review cycle and a formal process for DHS/OHA to issue a management response to each QA report	
h. QA Reporting Too Low Organizationally in Both DHS/OHA and CoverOregon	The reporting structure of Maximus in both CoverOregon and the DHS/OHA IT Project is too low. Maximus is overseeing the individuals who must review and approve their findings and payment.		Have Maximus report to either the HIX Program board of directors or DAS/CIO. Due to the fact that CoverOregon is not a state agency, this must be taken into account when deciding who Maximus should report to. There may be a need for a contract amendment and an interagency agreement to memorialize the final solution for this issue where HIX – IT QA is concerned.	2/21/13 all agreed that a process needs to be defined and that the process needs to assure timely review by DHS/DAS/CO, and timely payment to Maximus. We also agreed that the LFO would receive timely reports, but only after DHS/CO/DAS review and approval.
i. Unclear Role of the DAS Chief Information Office in the QA	Should Maximus report to the DAS CIO Office? Should DAS serve as a referee in the		There may be a need for a contract amendment and an interagency	2/21/13 all agreed to execute a contract amendment and interagency agreement

ISSUES	DESCRIPTION	EFFECTS/IMPACTS	POTENTIAL SOLUTION(S)	RECOMMENDATION
Reports Review Process	report review process? Should DAS be an additional “approver” (i.e. final approver) for Maximus deliverables?		agreement to memorialize the final solution for this issue.	placing DAS CIO as the approving entity for Contract Statement of Work changes, Quality Management Plan changes, and QA status and improvement reports. This amendment is drafted and ready to execute
3. Trust Related				
a. DHS/OHA and Maximus	There is clear evidence that there is a level of distrust between DHS/OHA and Maximus related to a wide-variety of issues (i.e. QA reports, new business, timeliness of payment, feelings of retaliation, unprofessional and hostile conduct etc.).		Investigate professional workplace issues per Statewide and DHS/OHA policies. Respond appropriately based on evidence gathered.	Further discussion at 2/28/13 meeting
b. DHS/OHA and CoverOregon	There is clear evidence that there is also a level of distrust between DHS/OHA and CoverOregon related to a wide-variety of issues (i.e. openness and transparency, teamwork, lack of common success goals, etc.).			Further discussion at 2/28/13 meeting
4. QC & IV&V Vendor Selection	There has been an ongoing disagreement between DHS/OHA and DAS with respect to whether Maximus should also perform all QC & IV&V services on the HIX IT effort. Whether all QA and QC activities are done by a single vendor or by multiple vendors, there are potential challenges. Best practices advice from Gartner Group and QAI indicate that either approach can be effective.		Execute an opportunity notice and obtain a separate QC & IV&V contractor for HIX IT via the Statewide QA Services Contract.	Execute an opportunity notice and obtain a separate QC & IV&V contractor for HIX IT via the Statewide QA Services Contract. Note: This issue was decided in October 2012. 2/21/13 All agreed. Contract is ready to allow
5. HIX IT Project (DHS/OHA) Transparency Issues	Both Maximus and CoverOregon feel that the DHS/OHA team is not as open and transparent as to what it is doing as it should be.			2/21/13 all agreed to be careful what we put in emails and that we would be careful of using words (i.e. lack of transparency) which did not accurately describe the QA’s concerns or reality. Further discussion at 2/28/13 meeting

Formatted: Highlight

ISSUES	DESCRIPTION	EFFECTS/IMPACTS	POTENTIAL SOLUTION(S)	RECOMMENDATION
6. Oracle Contract Issues	Maximus has indicated in several of its QA quarterly reports that there are contractual and accounting practices being utilized by DHS/OHA that are inconsistent with generally acceptable industry best practice procedures.			2/21/13 meeting it was acknowledged that this issue has been solved. A SOS audit found everything in order
7. DHS/OHA as “Systems Integrator” Issue	Maximus has reported that DHS/OHA’s decision to act as the “systems integrator” for the HIX IT Project is not what is typically done. They have reported major concerns on the effectively of this approach and the difficulty in provide QA/QC services in this type of environment.			Discuss at 2/28/13 meeting
8. Operational and Financial Impacts	It has been reported that CoverOregon intends to transition away from DHS/OHA Shared (Foundational) services provisioning and establish its own instance (entire technology stack) of HIX to be operated and maintained by CoverOregon (beginning in January 2014). This establishes a duplicate and redundant infrastructure and appears to remove significant ongoing cost sharing/funding from DHS/OHA. Operational/budget impact of this development is unknown to DAS/CIO and LFO at the present time.			Discuss at 2/28/13 meeting
	DHS/OHA OIS is apparently undergoing a major reorganization. This has been accompanied by key staff retirements and transitions out of the agency. Key staff loses (Project Management staff in particular) may put status of HIX-IT and all other DHS/OHA OIS projects at risk. Impact of reorganization and staff losses is unknown to DAS/CIO and LFO at the present time.			

Formatted: Highlight

- Formatted: Font: 14 pt, Bold
- Formatted: Highlight
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.03"