**UHC Discussion 08/02/24- Key Takeaways**

**Access to original Bartrack reports-** The initial idea was to track the source of the bartrack reports and extract the relevant details, assuming that the original database would be in a more consistent format. However, structured data is only available for the Oxford Book of Business. The rest of the bartrack reports come from data entered by the sales team into an application that we might not have access to. If gaining access to this application would enable us to obtain the source of truth in a consistent format, the client will attempt to provide access. As of now, the SharePoint link provides access to all the bartrack reports.

**Information on CIRRUS tables-** Around 30-35 tables were used to construct the CIRRUS database. A PDF crosswalk of all the backend CIRRUS tables contains correlations and key columns, which proves very useful. While building new queries may be counterproductive as queries are already in place for extracting necessary data, a walkthrough on how the tables have been joined can be provided. The true benefit lies in understanding how queries work and are successful in pulling data for specific field values. The current CIRRUS tables and results cover all 42 fields needed for ID cards, with queries already created for them. Support from the UHC team is available for creating queries if alterations are needed.

**Auditing Process Timeline:** One part of the auditing process involves extracting data from the CIRRUS production environment, which appears highly structured and unlikely to cause standardization or consistency problems. It also entails fetching data from the bartrack system, which requires standardization before comparison after which the data from CIRRUS is compared to the source of truth. The other part is that, the auditing process must adhere to specific timelines. While certain reviews occur 15 days prior to renewal, last-minute changes can also occur. The client expects the entire process to be automated to enable daily refresh of results and logging of discrepancies into a dashboard. This automation is crucial as the frequency of auditing may vary, with daily auditing required during peak renewal periods. Typically, renewals occur in a specific month each year unless a retroactive change is made mid-year or three months into the renewal period. However, there is currently no system in place to alert auditors to retroactive changes unless manually checked in the bartrack. Thus, continuous monitoring of discrepancies and changes in the bartrack, preferably on a daily basis, is essential. **Note:** The client requires this automation to run for all groups each day. Given the volume of groups, optimizing the runtime of automation through a defined cadence or timeline would enhance efficiency.

**Correction of discrepancies-** In the manual process when the source of truth and cirrus do not match, a ticket is sent to the configuration team and they look at the bartrack reports and change the values. After we have built the automation, the responsibility is on UHC’s internal team to make sure that it is a true discrepancy and raise a ticket if so.

**Need for manual intervention-** The dynamic orientation of data, especially embedded files, presents a challenge. While OCR and ML algorithms can be utilized, there will inevitably be some error rate. However, the audit process must achieve 100% accuracy as errors are unacceptable. Therefore, a certain level of manual intervention is necessary to verify the possibility of errors. We could provide dashboards and information on audits that did not match, which can be facilitated through manual intervention. CIRRUS data is stable, but for bartrack, certain checks are necessary to ensure the accurate representation of data in the CIRRUS system.

**Suggested approach**- We could follow a two-step process: The first step is to establish a process flow and automate procedures as much as possible to align the CIRRUS system with the source of truth. The second step involves providing a systematic representation, such as a panel or dashboard/report, of all the gaps. These gaps refer to values, fields, or groups that were not accurately matched. This enables the client to perform manual intervention on those gaps. Although we aim to automate this step to some extent, manual intervention may be required beyond a certain point to ensure error-free audits. The goal is to seamlessly structure the report to minimize the time and effort required for manual intervention.

**Client input-** The client suggests that the best approach is to categorize the various ways in which documents are submitted in the bartrack report. Then, tailor different methods to standardize and extract information from each of these categories. **Note**- The way in which documents are submitted by sales is consistent across all renewals periods, but differs across the books of business. Once the sales submit something, that is the format they will always use. So in future the format for each group will be the same and will not change over time.

**Field level focus-** Since some fields remain stable while others change frequently, such as deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses which are usually consistent, it is observed that certain field values among our total 42 fields may be inconsistent. We can consider narrowing down on the fields that change the most and examine common problem statements associated with these fields. This approach would allow us to focus on how we can audit these processes to achieve better results. s.