Project Closeout Report

Submitted to Project Oversight on 12/19/2022

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name: MMIS Application Programming Interface

Agency Name: Department of Health and Human Services

Project Sponsor: Alyssa Neis

Project Manager: Jacob Chaput

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) seeks to allow patients to have better access to their health data. CMS and the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC) have issued the Interoperability and Patient Access final rule requiring Medicaid and Medicare advantage plans to develop a patient access Application Programming Interface (API) and a provider directory API. North Dakota Department of Human Services (DHS) will need to procure and implement a Health Level 7 Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (HL7 FHIR) API with the current Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS).

SCHEDULE AND COST METRICS

	Project Start Date	Baseline End Date	Baseline Budget	Funding Source	Actual Finish Date	Schedule Variance	Actual Cost	Cost Variance
Original Baseline	10/6/2020	2/14/2022	$656,082.00	Federal (CMS) and General Funding	12/19/2022	61% Over	$712,172.50	8.5% Over
Final Baseline		12/1/2022	$754,491.40	Federal (CMS) and General Funding	12/19/2022	2% Over	$712,172.50	5% Under

Notes:

Project scope was added in March 2022 to incorporate new required work. Time and Materials based development came in underestimate used in updated baseline.

MAJOR SCOPE CHANGES

Development of a Member Authentication interface to the solution for members and authorized representatives was added.

OBJECTIVES

Business Objective	Measurement Description	Met/ Not Met	Measurement Outcome
Comply with Interoperability and Patient Access final rule.	DHS will report to CMS when solution is implemented and live.	Met	All components of the CMS Interoperability Rule have been implemented to meet final rule and will be reported in next quarterly CMS report.

KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORIES

A lessons learned effort is performed after the project is completed. This process uses surveys and meetings to determine what happened in the project and identifies actions for improvement going forward. Typical findings include, “What did we do well?” and “What didn’t go well and how can we fix it the next time?”

Key Lessons Learned and Success Stories
State team was staffed with knowledgeable and personable project management as well as experienced and accessible business analysts and leadership that have worked together in previous projects. This allowed the team to learn new technologies and address issues quickly.
Project team was able to collaborate and facilitate well using Microsoft Teams and OneNote tools.
State team received training on the system midway through development. Design decisions required revisiting as a result to ensure a quality product. Having the training earlier, before development would have prevented rework.
Project team may have worked better with more focused meetings. By relying on a weekly catch-all meeting, the team sometimes could not get through long discussions on business and technical decisions. Identifying those decisions and having separate, smaller meetings would have allowed the team to progress faster.