###### Deliverable

ID and Title: Deliverable: (D-37) Carrier Enrollment Interface Control Document

Description:

Interface requirements documents to support the Carrier Enrollment Interface. The ICD will address the major function being supported, direction (one or two way), the major integration points, a specific list of the data elements, and the frequency (batch or interactive).

The document will also describe external inputs to, and outputs from, a system for some potential or actual user of the system. The ICD will define the data elements in the interface, the method of transfer, frequency, and contingency plans in the event the interface fails.

Submission Date: 5/17/13 Comments Due: 5/24/13

Submission: Second

###### Review Record

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Reference | Observation | Recommendation | Type | CGI Response |
| 1 | Section #, Page # | Describe item of concern | Where applicable, identify recommendation. | See key below | For use in identifying resolution |
| 2 | Section # 2, Page # 1 | VT HBE Integration Hub should be renamed as VT Integration Hub |  | Recommended | Done |
| 3 | Section # 2, Page # 32 | Section does not describe reconciliation process if it is going to be manual process as defined in Section 5.7# then what is the triggering process |  | Recommended | Outside the scope of an ICD |
| 4 | p. 3 §2.3 | Secure FTP is mentioned, thought Web Services was being used | Clarify use of SFTP or primacy of Web Services | Recommended | Both are being used; document fully describes scenarios. |
|  | §2.4 | “external world” vague | Specify external orgs/entities to which we are interfacing | Recommended | Done. |
|  | §2.5 | “Reconciliation processes” is vague | Clarify reconciliation process definition. Is this for enrollment or payments? Or something else | Recommended | Done. |
|  | §4.2.1, #5 | Does intiate group get a response acknowledgement?  On what basis call back will be correlated to intial call ? | Add clarifying language | Recommended | These are high-level depictions for business people. Detail like this is in the sequence diagrams. |
|  | §4.2.2, #1 | Is it OPA rule and mode of interaction can be described here | Please describe further | Recommended | Done |
|  | §4.2.2, #3 | On what basis call back will identify initial call | Please describe further | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | §4.2.3, #6 | Does the notification go through thunderhead. Integration with it can be shown clearly | Please describe further | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | §5, bullet 1 | Use of Thunderhead unclear | Do you use thunderhead for notification? If so lay it out in all descriptions | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | §5, bullet 2 | Any plans to use OSB for service virtualizations and centralized security in HIH/Vermont Integration Hub? | Recommended usage of OSB is for abstracting services for portal, external services (Carrier Serivices), external facing services and call back service end points. Centralized Security can be enforced in this layer. | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | p. 30 | Design recommendation | From description BAM triggers are for real-time monitoring of transactions. OEM 12 C has ADP and BTM which serves the same purpose. Implementing BAM for this use case could be complex compared to using BTM or ADP. Need more discussion to determine right tool for this. | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | p.30 | Description of data transformation missing (or is it captured elsewhere) | Is this 834/999 are EDI file format or equivalent XML format. IF EDI file format any thoughts on how transformation between XML in SOA to EDI and EDI to XML would work. It would be nice to detail it. | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | p. 33 | Error handing/notification needs clarification | After retries will there be alert notification for correcting the system that is generating technical error and for the manual retry? Any thoughts how the reties will be staged? | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | p. 33 | Exception handling clarification requested | Possible business exceptions and how it is planned to be handled can be elaborated. If ICD does not cover alternate or exception scenarios in full detail which artifact covers it.  In SOA and integration error and exception handling scenario should be thoroughly thought through for a fool proof system | Recommended | Outside scope of ICD |
|  | Appendix A | Missing some acronyms | More acronyms like QHP SOA, BPEL HBE BAM BPM may be added. Or refer to a master acronyms document | Recommended | Tech Writer added suggested acronyms at right to the document. A Master acronym document is also available. |

Type Key:

* Required: does not meet contract or DED specifications or is a factual error – must be addressed
* Recommended: recommended to better address deliverable purpose, may require discussion to determine agreed-upon resolution
* Optional: a cosmetic correction or recommended improvement

###### Acceptance Criteria Checklist

| Acceptance Criteria | Reference |
| --- | --- |
| Describes external inputs to and all outputs from a system for some potential or actual user of the system. | Throughout document |
| ICDs will define data elements in the interface, the method of transfer and the frequency of the transactions. | Throughout document |
| Describe the process for the contingency plan if the interface should fail. | Sections 5.7 – 5.8 |

###### Deliverable Disposition

Approver: Justin Tease

Reviewer(s): Rick Ketcham, Paul Haigh

Disposition:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Disposition | Comments |
| □ Approved |  |
| □ Rejected |  |

Approver’s signature:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Approver Name |  |  |  |
| Signature |  | Date |  |