



State of Illinois Interoperability Project

Options Analysis

March 2013

About the Options Analysis

Background

- The Illinois Interoperability Project is tasked with designing and developing a sustainable governance model for the Illinois Healthcare and Human Services Framework Project (the Framework).
- The Framework is a seven-agency collaborative focused on the development of a modern, horizontally-integrated system to support the core processes of service delivery.
- The Framework's key goals are *to improve service access and delivery; increase operational efficiency and program integrity; and, create a capacity for sophisticated analysis and data driven decision-making across the Illinois healthcare and human services space.*

Purpose of the Options Analysis

- In order to design and develop a governance model for the Illinois Framework, the Illinois Interoperability Project Team (Team), will evaluate and compare two potential Framework project governance models.
- After analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of each model, the Team will recommend a draft governance model for the Illinois Framework.
- The Team will present the governance models to various stakeholders who will review the options and reach consensus to select the final Framework governance model.

Choosing a Framework Governance Model

- The following stakeholders will decide on the final governance model for the Illinois Framework:
 - State of Illinois Chief Information Officer (CIO)
 - IL Framework Director
 - IL Framework Executive Steering Committee (ESC)
 - The ESC is composed of Agency Heads, representatives of the Governor's Office, and representatives of federally-funded health and human services initiatives (MMIS, ACA, and HIE).
- Although the stakeholders will use the options analysis to consider the costs and benefits of various governance models, the stakeholders may or may not choose one of the options outlined in this presentation.
- Additionally, the options in this presentation are not mutually exclusive; the stakeholders may decide to combine options or choose various elements from each.
- Ultimately, the stakeholders will develop a model that is unique to the Illinois Framework.

Developing the Options

- This options analysis evaluates two governance models: Option A and Option B.
- Both Options include the governing bodies that were designated in the Illinois Framework Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA), signed in 2012. These bodies are:
 - The Executive Steering Committee (ESC)
 - The Operational Committee (OC)
 - Subcommittees
- Both Options also include additional governing bodies that were proposed in the Framework Request for Proposal (RFP). These bodies are:
 - Subject Matter Experts (SME)
 - Advisory Council
- Both Options include a Project Management Office (PMO). The Framework PMO was established in October 2012.

Developing the Options

- Options A and B present various ways of engaging the governing bodies. The ways of engaging the governing bodies are described by the following categories:
 - Membership
 - Responsibilities
 - Frequency of Meetings
 - Decision Making
 - Interacts With (who the governing body interacts with within the entire Framework governance structure)
 - Reports To (who the governing body formally reports to within the entire Framework governance structure)
 - Time Commitment
 - Form of Communication (how the various bodies within the Framework governance structure communicate)
- An example of how Option A and Option B might differ according to these categories is that Option A requires consensus in decision making while Option B does not.

About the Analysis

- The Interoperability Team performed in-depth research on best practices on project governance and interviewed a series of subject-matter experts from states and local municipalities around the U.S. [see “Best Practices Research Summary”].
- From the research and interviews, the Team developed six “attributes of good governance.” These are:
 - Shared vision
 - Executive Leadership
 - Formalization of Structure
 - Clear Decision-Making
 - Adaptable
 - Transparent Communications and Processes
- Option A and Option B were evaluated against their ability to meet these six attributes of good governance.

About the Analysis

- The Options Analysis is also based on findings from the following:
 - In-depth discussions with the Framework PMO and project advisers, Stewards of Change.
 - The Framework Stakeholder Engagement Project, which interviewed Agency Directors on the preferred structure of the Advisory Council.
 - Successful governance models in similar interoperability projects. For example, the subcommittees suggested in this presentation are modeled on National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) subcommittees.

About the Analysis

- An example of how the Team used its research findings to perform the options analysis:
 - One interviewee indicated that the success of her governance model was partly due to the fact that she did not allow designees at her meetings. All other interviewees agreed that not allowing designees in meetings helped build trust amongst participants; however, some governance models do allow designees. Therefore, the Illinois Interoperability Team compared a governance model that does not allow designees in meetings (Option A) to a model that does allow designees (Option B). The Team weighed the strengths and weaknesses of each option, ultimately preferring the option that better represented the attributes of good governance.

Options Analysis

Current State of Framework Governance

- Agency Directors interact, but it is unclear how often they interact and if they interact formally.
- It is unclear when and if Agency CIOs interact.
- Agency decisions happen in silos.
- There is no higher court of appeals for decision-making.
- The need to develop a governance structure is reaching a critical stage.
 - Decisions that affect multiple agencies are already being made by other means.

Assumptions when Developing the Options

- The rules and responsibilities identified in the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) are binding.
- Committee members will actively participate in the governance process.
- There will be continued support from the highest executive level.
- Federal funding for State interoperability will continue to drive Framework and ESC activities.
- The ESC will develop the criteria that determines which issues reach their level of decision making.

Description of the Options

In general, the two options have the following characteristics :

Option A

- Membership: Allows no designees in meetings; Advisory Council is a “committee of committees”
- Responsibilities: Same as Option B (written in IGA)
- Frequency of Meetings: Meets more often than Option B
- Decision Making: Consensus when decisions are made
- Interacts With: Designees are not allowed to interact with members of other governing bodies
- Reports To: same as Option B
- Time Commitment: More time commitment than Option B; full-time PMO
- Form of Communication: More in-person communication than Option B

Option B

- Membership: Allows designees in meetings; Advisory Council is a workgroup of a larger State Commission
- Responsibilities: Same as Option A (written in IGA)
- Frequency of Meetings: Meets less often than Option A
- Decision Making: Majority rules voting (one voice, one vote) if consensus is not met
- Interacts With: Designees are allowed to interact with members of other governing bodies
- Reports To: same as Option A
- Time Commitment: Less time commitment than Option A; part-time PMO
- Form of Communication: Less in-person communication than Option A

Overview of Option A

Option A	Membership	Responsibilities	Frequency of Meetings	Decision Making	Interacts With	Reports To	Time Commitment	Form of communication
ESC	agency directors, CIO, Representatives of GOMB, CMS, MMIS, HIE, ACA, and others as designated by CIO	provide executive leadership and oversight of all matters of finance and policy in connection with the Framework Project	Monthly is typical based on workload	Consensus	PMO, OC and others if invited to ESC meetings	no one	2 Hours per month	in person, briefing documents sent before meetings
OC	Policy, Operations and IT staff identified by ESC	provide week-to-week coordination and operational guidance for the Project	bi-weekly, additional meetings may be called as needed by Framework Director	Consensus, escalation to ESC for decisions when needed	PMO, ESC, and others as needed	ESC	4 hours per month	in person, email, and phone
Liaisons	one or more well seasoned staff members from each agency identified by ESC, may also be a member of OC, or SME	assist Framework Planning team to connect with the right individuals within each program area	no formal meetings	none	PMO, SMEs, others as needed	no one	16 - 24 hours per month	in person, email, and phone
SME	designated by liaisons, may also be the liaison or member of the OC	interviewed and asked to review documentation about their program	no formal meetings	none	PMO, Liaisons, others as needed	no one	16 - 24 hours per month	in person, email, and phone
PMO	includes director, staff in the following areas; program, business, technical, communications & change mgmt, and administrative (clerical) staff	provide planning for and day-to-day management of overall project	Daily interaction	none	all	ESC, OC	full time	in person, email, and phone
Sub-Committees; 1. Communications & Change Management 2. Business Architecture 3. Technical Architecture 4. Legal Privacy Confidentiality	comprised of stakeholders from various levels	to further the mission & objectives of the Framework Project & ensure the project responds to the requirements of the stakeholders	meet on as needed basis, the OC calls the meetings	none	OC, PMO, SMEs, Liaisons	OC	to be determined	in person, email and phone
Advisory Council	committee of committees	Advise OC & ESC, and represent service needs of multiple constituencies	quarterly	none	PMO, others as needed	no one	2 hours per quarter	in person, briefing documents sent before meetings

Overview of Option B (changes from Option A are underlined)

Option B	Membership	Responsibilities	Frequency of Meetings	Decision Making	Interacts With	Reports To	Time Commitment	Form of communication
ESC	agency directors <u>or their designees</u> , CIO, Representatives of GOMB, CMS, MMIS, HIE, ACA, and others as designated by CIO	provide executive leadership and oversight of all matters of finance and policy in connection with the Framework Project.	<u>less often than monthly</u>	<u>Consensus, but if consensus not reached CIO can call a vote which would be majority rules</u>	ESC members <u>or their designees</u> interact with PMO and OC and others if invited to ESC meetings	no one	<u>1 Hour per month</u>	meetings can be in person <u>or by phone</u> , briefing documents sent before meetings
OC	Policy, Operations and IT staff <u>or their designees</u> identified by ESC	provide week-to-week coordination and operational guidance for the Project	bi-weekly	<u>Consensus or majority vote, with escalation to ESC for decisions when needed</u>	<u>OC members or their designees interact</u> with PMO, ESC, and others as needed	ESC	<u>2 hours per month</u>	in person, email, and phone
Liaisons	one or more well seasoned staff members from each agency <u>or their designees</u> identified by ESC, may also be a member of OC, or SME	assist Framework Planning team to connect with the right individuals within each program area	none	none	PMO, SMEs, others as needed	No one	<u>Less than 16 - 24 hours per month</u>	in person, email, and phone
SME	designated by liaisons, may also be the liaison or member of the OC	interviewed and asked to review documentation about their program	no formal meetings	none	PMO, Liaisons, others as needed	no one	<u>Less than 16 - 24 hours per month</u>	in person, email, and phone
PMO	includes director, staff in the following areas; program, business, technical, communications & change mgmt., and administrative (clerical) staff	provide planning for and day-to-day management of overall project	Daily interaction	none	interact with everyone	ESC, OC	<u>part time</u>	in person, email, and phone
Sub-Committees; 1.Communications & Change Management 2.Business Architecture 3.Technical Architecture 4.Legal Privacy Confidentiality	comprised of stakeholders from various levels	to further the mission & objectives of the Framework Project & ensure the project responds to the requirements of the stakeholders	meet on as needed basis, the OC calls the meetings	none	OC, PMO, SMEs, Liaisons	OC	to be determined	in person, email and phone
Advisory Council	<u>Human Services Commission Workgroup</u>	Advise OC & ESC, and represent service needs of multiple constituencies	quarterly	none	PMO, others as needed	no one	<u>1 hour per quarter</u>	meetings in person <u>or by phone</u> , briefing documents sent before meetings

Strengths: Option A

Option A

- No designees makes for better representation
- Regular monthly in-person meetings creates greater engagement and fosters trust
- Consensus decision making creates more buy-in, ownership, and accountability
- Advisory Council leverages existing committees
- Because decisions must reach consensus, this requires more informed decision making
- A full time PMO ensures daily and efficient project management

Strengths: Option B

Option B

- Designees can represent committee members if they are unavailable
- Decisions are made even if consensus is not reached
- Allows for more ways to communicate than Option A
- Because consensus does not need to be reached, the governing body could have potentially faster decision making

Weaknesses: Option A

Option A

- Requires fairly ample time commitment from committee members
- Because consensus must be reached, decision making may take longer

Weaknesses: Option B

Option B

- Because designees are allowed, there is less buy-in, ownership, and engagement
- The Advisory Council would require formation of additional workgroup
- Because decisions can be made by a vote, there may be less informed decision making
- A part-time PMO would not provide as effective project management

Risk Analysis: Options A

Option A

- If committee members are not able to come to a meeting, they are not represented
- If consensus is not met, then a decision is not made
- Scheduling difficulties may delay meetings

Risk Analysis: Option B

Option B

- Members feel less involved if designees attend on their behalf, or if meetings are not attended in person
- If a vote is called, members may not be happy with decisions
- Members will have loss of interest

Attributes of Good Governance: Option A v. Option B

Attribute	Option A	Option B	Better Option?
<p>Shared vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Framework, ESC members will develop a shared vision, including common goals and an equal understanding of the issues at hand. 	<p>A shared vision is developed by consensus by the ESC members themselves (no designees).</p>	<p>A shared vision is not necessarily developed by consensus or by the ESC members (designees).</p>	<p>Option A</p>
<p>Executive Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Framework, strong leaders will need to create buy-in, build momentum, and champion the project within their agencies. 	<p>ESC members are committed to attending meetings and actively participating in the governance process. This may result in greater knowledge and more buy-in.</p>	<p>ESC members may send their designees to participate in the governance process. This may result in gaps of knowledge and less buy-in.</p>	<p>Option A</p>
<p>Formalization of Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Framework governing bodies will document the policies, charters, organization charts, and timelines that define the project. 	<p>A full-time PMO can manage the administrative functions related to convening meetings and implementing decisions.</p>	<p>A part-time PMO will convene meetings and implement decisions on a limited basis.</p>	<p>Option A</p>
<p>Clear Decision-Making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework decision-makers should strive to make decisions that are well-informed and agreed upon by all parties. 	<p>Consensus requires that all members agree to the decision being made.</p>	<p>Majority rules voting means that some members may not be pleased with decisions being made.</p>	<p>Option A</p>
<p>Adaptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Framework governance structure should be flexible so that it can adapt in response to changes in the project scope. 	<p>Frequent meetings allow decisions to be made in a timely manner. Governing bodies can respond to changes quickly.</p>	<p>Less frequent meetings create lag time between when changes happen and when responses can be made.</p>	<p>Option A</p>
<p>Transparent Communications and Processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework decision-making processes should be open to stakeholder input. Outcomes should be clear. 	<p>The Advisory Council is composed of internal and external participants of all agencies.</p>	<p>The Advisory Council is a workgroup of a State Commission, which may or may not represent all agencies.</p>	<p>Option A</p>

Recommendations

- The State of Illinois Interoperability Project Team recommends that the Illinois Framework Executive Steering Committee select Option A because it meets all of the attributes of good governance.

Next Steps

Next Steps

- The Interoperability Team will work with Framework Stakeholders to decide upon - and implement - a governance model for the Framework.
- Framework stakeholders will develop the processes and procedures needed to implement the model.
- Examples of the documentation required to formalize the Framework governance model are found on the following slides, including:
 - A roles and responsibilities matrix
 - A project governance organization chart
- Other documents include:
 - A charter
 - A vision statement

Roles and Responsibilities Matrix

Type of Decision	ESC	OC (and subcommittees)	Advisory Council	Liaisons	SMEs	PMO
Policy Decisions						
Funding Decisions						
Day-to-day technical issues						
Day-to-day business issues						
Communications						
Privacy and security issues						
Project Management						

To be decided by Framework ESC, Project Director and CIO

R=Responsible; A=Accountable; C=Consulted; I=Informed

Organization Chart





State of Illinois Interoperability Project

Options Analysis

March 2013