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| **Meeting Logistics** |
| **Organizer:** | Marci Roth |
| **Time:** | 1 pm EST |
| **Date:** | 09/21/2023 |
| **Location:** | APHSA Zoom Call  |
| **Next Meeting:** | Oct 2023. |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Attendees** |
| Bertha Levin | Lynnea Kaufman | Marissa McTavish |
| Marcus Robinson | Duane Fontenot | Yashwant k  |
| Cory Ozment | Joyce Distler | Michele Lidle |
| Teresa Sturgill | Stephanie Lindley | Jerrica Boyer |
| Bharadwaj Kalyanam | Clint Walker | Robert Haughton |
| Michele Ainsworth | Andrea Ramsey-Mitchell | Charles Gentemann  |
| Sam Brandenburg | Karen Austin | Anandhi Rajamani |
| Raj Bommareddy | Leigh-Anne Bordas | Phillip Poolaw |
| Michele Ainsworth | Kasey Kharel  | Connie Rogers |
| Angie Stackhouse | Joyce Distler | Sara Lovorn |
| Kevin Sanders | Carissa Decker | Shernelle Crawford |
| Lila Mutschelknaus | Rodney Gilbertson | Kimberlee Pepper |
| Stephanie Lindley | Tetrus-Raghu Govindaraj | Tetrus- Tom Livoti |
| Tetrus - Susmita Linga | Tetrus – Swathi Reddy |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meeting Objectives:** |
| * To discuss technical updates, existing issues, resolutions.

Link to sept 21, 2023: <https://aphsa.zoom.us/rec/share/I6Gt0F__LHsOv-g_fUOGrUOLw-4RAflUssFgUQpXRrwayACZ7xPThJAYv5KdYV5O.jPWXx6gx6wc6WfSp>Passcode: B5QJbt%f |
|  |
| **Agenda** |
| 1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Alabama Implementation Lessons Learned
3. NCH 1.0 Conversion to NCH 2.0 Updates: Reminder: Microsoft 1.0 Bridge discontinued Deadline May 2024
* Idaho
* Indiana
* Kentucky
* Maine
* Minnesota
* Missouri
* North Carolina
* Ohio
* West Virginia
1. NCH 2.0 Implementation Updates
* Arizona
* Arkansas
* Colorado
* Louisiana
* Maryland
* Massachusetts
* Washington
* Washington D.C.
1. 2.0 State Updates
* Texas
* Tennessee

  |
|  Agenda Item | Discussion |  Action Items |
| * Alabama Implementation Lessons Learned
 | * Al explained how their system was designed and implemented.
* In the AL system, to be able to be in an ICPC case, they had to have the case and a client in focus and because the case comes from the Neice clearing house, they wouldn't know who the sending state and the child was. So, they had to build a staging area in the administrative section of their program so that when transmittals came, they could go there. The ICPC workers can look at them on a workload screen, what they've received. If they received everything they needed. If they've not received everything they need with that transmittal, then it can stay on the workload, and they don't transfer it over into the client or the case side until they have everything that they need.
* Once they do that, their system allows them, from the workload screen, to create their intake, which then leads to their referral. Which gets the child and the family into their system, and then from the referral, they can automatically create their provider record, and they can provide their case. So, that's how the workflows with the AL program, from the staging area into intake, to referral, and then to their case.
* AL used the specifications document that Tetrus provided instead of creating a separate business document. and built the code.
* According to what would be mandatory and what was conditional.

Development team inputs:1. AL initially had an issue with the way their FACTS system dealt with the case compared to any other system. The challenging part was to correlate both systems.
* The team had a lot of meetings with the business analysts and the ICPC workers to understand the system in depth with respect to the regulation type and the type of care.
1. The other challenging issue was state IDs and Neice IDs. The team assumed it would be one state ID and one Neice ID while they transferred to the Neice clearing house. But later realized there will be different Neice IDs for the same child and the same provider depending on the regulation type or the type of care. So, understanding when they get a new neiceid, state ID, helped them design the tables.
2. Considering the complexity and the challenges, the team decided to code based on the XML, the mapping document provided by Tetrus, and the XML files (transmittal XML's provided by Tetrus).
* It took AL to go through the Excel sheet and the XML's for around 3–4 months, which helped them code all the tables and validate everything based on the XML document. Team AL mentioned that

was the right decision they made, as they only had a couple of minor issues after going live.1. The team is storing all the XML files, whatever they are receiving from other states , as well as whatever they are sending to other states. Other than extracting the data and putting it into the table.
* They store the entire XML except the file attachment part. Whenever they get an issue with other states or when they send any transmittal,

When they see an issue exception in the transmittal, they immediately go there and look at the core XML, and it's easy for them to identify any issue just by looking at the XML.1. Data migration was another challenging issue. They have data from 2016 onwards in the Neice system, but unfortunately, either in the Neice Clearinghouse or the FACTS system, both don't carry other IDs.

Neice Clearinghouse does not carry Alabama IDs, and in the same way, FACTS do not carry Neice IDs to Neice cases, provider IDs, or client IDs. The team resolved this, and there were many data fixes after 3 weeks of production release andNow that the system is stable, AL is working on enhancements. |  |
| NCH 1.0 Conversion to NCH 2.0 Updates: | * ID- The NCH 2.0 project is underway. The development effort has started. They are currently in the process of establishing connectivity to the NCH dev and UAT environments, and they've started some coding changes with the simpler XPath changes in the XML payload. They will have an update on the live date soon.
* IN- They're continuing into the project planning phase. They will soon finalize the date.
* KY- Wrapping up the user requirements document for the transition from 1.0 to 2.0. Also includes some fixes that they'veidentified along the way in their NCH 1.0. Planning to go live in first quarter of 2024.
* ME- Have a final design meeting scheduled with their team for the NCH 2.0 update. Maine is slated to deploy that NCH 2.0 into their production environment on the evening of March 25th, 2024.

 * MN-Resource issue. Planning to meet the deadline by May 31, 2024.
* MO- Still doing analysis by going through the interface specification document. Going through the new fields that need to be added to their system and the database.
* NC- There is no one from the state.
* OH- Planning to start design sessions from next month. No live date as of now.
* WV- Working on resolving issues with NCH 1.0 and NCH 2.0 is still in the planning phase. They are planning to meet the deadline.
* Reminder- for the 1.0 to 2.0 transition as Microsoft Azure classic services are being deprecated, and they are no longer going to be supported from the second quarter of next year (May 2024).
 |  |
| * NCH 2.0 Implementation updates
 | * AZ- No update regarding NCH 2.0 They have set up a new test server for MCMS, and installation is in progress.
* AR- There is no one from the state.
* CO- Have approval for SDP. No update on NCH 2.0. They will soon have an update.
* DE- The team is testing MuleSoft connectivity to the clearing house to get transmittal back. They are still in the early stages.
* LA – Currently seeking vendor for the Cwis project. Once finalized, they will move on with the development. As of now, the fall of 2024 is the target date.
* MD- No one from technical team. No one from the technical team Tentative date: November 2023.
* MA- There is no one from the state.
* MS- They are still going through the documentation. They haven’t started anything.
* WA- There is no one from the state.
* Washington D.C.- There is no one from the state.
 |  |
| * 2.0 State Updates
 | * TX- Conversion from migration 1.0 to 2.0, mandatory fields issue with 1.0 state. Tetrus addressed the issue by checking with KY.
* TN- Working on retrieving pending transactions. Working with Tetrus.
 |  |