

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

RPTS KERR

DCMN CRYSTAL

FAILURE TO VERIFY: CONCERNS REGARDING

PPACA'S ELIGIBILITY SYSTEM

WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2014

House of Representatives,

Subcommittee on Health,

Committee on Energy and Commerce,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m., in Room 2322, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Joseph R. Pitts [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Pitts, Shimkus, Blackburn, Gingrey, McMorris Rodgers, Lance, Cassidy, Guthrie, Griffith, Bilirakis, Ellmers, Pallone, Schakowsky, Green, Barrow, Castor, and Waxman (ex officio).

Staff Present: Clay Alspach, Chief Counsel, Health; Matt Bravo,

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Professional Staff Member; Leighton Brown, Press Assistant; Paul Edattel, Professional Staff Member, Health; Sydne Harwick, Legislative Clerk; Katie Novaria, Professional Staff Member, Health; Chris Pope, Fellow, Health; Chris Sarley, Policy Coordinator, Environment & Economy; Macey Sevcik, Press Assistant; Heidi Stirrup, Health Policy Coordinator; Ziky Ababiya, Minority Staff Assistant; Karen Lightfoot, Minority Communications Director and Senior Policy Advisor; and Matt Siegler, Minority Counsel.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. The subcommittee will come to order. The chair will recognize himself for an opening statement.

On July 1st, 2014, the Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General released two disturbing reports regarding eligibility verification for individuals purchasing coverage in the exchanges. According to the reports, between October 1st and December 31st, 2013, OIG identified 2.9 million inconsistencies between applicants' information and data received through the Data Hub or from other data sources. One-third of these is related to income.

Resolving these inconsistencies is often critical in determining eligibility for the nearly \$1 trillion in exchange subsidies that are being spent over the course of the next decade, and this is why Congress passed a law requiring the Secretary of HHS to certify that processes were in place to verify eligibility before subsidies were made available. Secretary Sebelius made such a certification to Congress on January 1st, 2014. Yet one OIG report states, quote, "As of the first quarter of 2014, the Federal marketplace was unable to resolve about 2.6 million of the 2.9 million inconsistencies because the CMS eligibility system was not fully operational. It was unable to resolve inconsistencies, even if applicants submitted appropriate documentation," end quote.

It is clear that the eligibility system is far from operational.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

CMS reports that it now has in place an interim manual process to resolve inconsistencies, and it hopes to have a fully automated process later this summer.

It is absolutely stunning that this administration, nearly a year after the launch of the exchanges and with \$1 trillion on the line, has yet to build a functioning eligibility system. Given the administration's false promises when it comes to Affordable Care Act implementation, CMS' hope to have a fully automated process up and running later this summer deserves to be treated with skepticism.

From telling Americans falsely that they could keep their health plan and doctors to Secretary Sebelius' commitment that the exchanges would be ready to launch on October 1st, implementation of this law has been a series of broken promises. Additionally, this problem appears to be getting worse, not better. According to documents released by this committee, as of May 27, at least 4 million inconsistencies have been identified.

These facts make it clear that the administration is taking a, quote, "shovel the money out the door first, verify later," end quote, approach when it comes to exchange subsidies. It is simply unacceptable that CMS does not yet have the internal controls necessary to validate Social Security numbers, citizenship, national status, income, and employer-sponsored coverage. Americans sending taxes to Washington don't deserve to have their money so blatantly disregarded

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

by a Federal Government that is supposed to serve them.

OIG has recommended that CMS, quote, "should develop and make public a plan on how and by what date the Federal marketplace will resolve inconsistencies," end quote. One has to wonder how long it will take to clear this backlog and whether proper internal controls will be in place to prevent this from happening again during the next open enrollment period this fall.

One also has to wonder how the administration intends to claw back any improper subsidies that were given as a result of inaccurate information. Middle-class families could be left on the hook for thousands of dollars in payments back to the IRS as a result of this failure.

My time has expired. I yield back. And now recognize the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Pallone, 5 minutes for an opening statement.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pitts follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me welcome the Office of the Inspector General's representatives here today. The work you do is invaluable to our committee and Congress, and there is always a role for us to strive to do better so we can ensure that taxpayer dollars are well spent.

But I think there are some important lessons I hope we can learn from today's hearing. The first and most important is the fact that a data inconsistency on a consumer's application does not equate to errors. In fact, nearly all of the cases of inconsistencies can be easily resolved. The second lesson is that we should use OIG to learn how we can strengthen our Federal programs, not as a political blunt object to mislead the American public.

We get it. Republicans don't like Obamacare. In fact, they won't recognize one single benefit from the law, and they predicted one disaster after another, and none of them have come true. I respect my chairman a lot, but, I mean, all I kept hearing in his comments about how we are so worried about this subsidy. Well, this subsidy goes to middle-class people, not to poor people, not to rich people. I think it is, what, something between \$25,000, \$30,000 and up to maybe \$80,000 or \$90,000 for a family of four in order to get the subsidy. That is the middle class. That is the middle class that we are trying to preserve. These are the average Americans.

Why are they so worried about a subsidy for middle-class people

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

instead of worrying about the big corporations or the oil companies. I could have 10 hearings on all the subsidies for the oil companies, and God knows what they are getting away with. These are not the fat cat contributors. This is the average person.

And the ACA is working. The results are in. Three independent surveys support this claim. During the law's first open enrollment period, 9.5 million previously uninsured Americans got health coverage, reducing the uninsured rate amongst working adults from 20 percent to 15 percent in less than a year. According to a Commonwealth Fund survey, the overwhelming majority of the newly ensured, including 74 percent of Republicans, are satisfied with their coverage.

Now, that doesn't mean the law is perfect. No one on my side of the aisle is arguing that. But we have had some technical hiccups with enrollment. The reports that OIG will discuss today, I believe, are a reflection of those challenges. We have learned how to improve the process. And this fall, the hope is to strengthen the system even further and capture millions more Americans who need healthcare coverage.

But if Republicans really want to talk about taxpayer dollars being spent wisely, let's have that conversation. We can talk about Speaker Boehner's frivolous lawsuit against the President or the wasteful \$3 billion being spent on this repetitive, unnecessary

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Benghazi fishing expedition. And then there is the 2.3 million they spent defending discrimination in the courts during the Defense of Marriage, or DOMA case.

The House GOP is interested in wasting taxpayer dollars to score political points. The ACA, on the other hand, is helping people get access to health care, and it is saving lives. So I would just ask my colleagues to stop the political stunts, stop trying to dismantle the ACA's success, and come together with Democrats to strengthen and improve its historic benefits and protections. We are trying to help the middle class. That is what this is all about. And without that subsidy, they are not going to be able to get health insurance.

So I would like to yield now 1 minute to Congressman Green from Texas.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pallone follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Green. Thank you, Chairman.

I thank the ranking member for yielding.

According to the recent report from the Commonwealth Fund, 9.5 million additional adults ages 19 to 64 are now covered by insurance. Seventy-three percent of the people who bought health plans and 87 percent of those signed up for Medicaid said they were pleased with the new insurance. Even 74 percent of the newly insured Republicans like their plans.

Mr. Chairman, there are certainly shortcomings in the Affordable Care Act both in policy and implementation, but as I always say, if you want something perfect, don't come to Congress or a legislative body. Yes, the 9.5 million newly insured and millions more are benefiting from reforms included in the law.

It is long past time to move beyond political posturing and misinformation campaigns to get back to business, time we start working to improve the law in ways where there is broad agreement. The American people deserve better, and I hope to work with my colleagues to build on this success and make changes that best serve the public.

And I yield back my time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Green follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pallone. I yield now to the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. Castor, the remainder.

Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Mr. Pallone.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing on how we improve the Affordable Care Act for America's families.

I appreciate the Inspector General's Office, all of the work you have done to help us identify where we need to improve.

Why is this important? Millions and millions of Americans are depending on us. And I look at my home State of Florida. We, surprisingly, had 1 million Floridians sign up through the Federal marketplace. It is remarkable. But now we are going to face a different open enrollment period starting November 15th to February 15th. We have got to ensure that this is working for our families. So help us prioritize where we have to pay additional attention, help us make this better for America's families.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Castor follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. All members' written opening statements will be made a part of the record.

[The information follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. On our panel today, we have two witnesses, Ms. Kay Daly, Assistant Inspector General, Office of Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and Ms. Joyce Greenleaf, Regional Inspector General, Office of Evaluation and Inspections, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Thank you for coming.

While we have two witnesses on our panel, I understand their statements are one and the same, so I will ask Ms. Daly to present the joint statement, and then both witnesses will be available for questions from members.

Ms. Daly, you will have 5 minutes to summarize your testimony. Your written testimony will be placed in the record. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

STATEMENT OF MS. KAY DALY, ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF AUDIT SERVICES, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; AND MS. JOYCE GREENLEAF, REGIONAL INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF EVALUATION AND INSPECTIONS, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Ms. Daly. Thank you, and good morning, Chairman Pitts, Ranking Member Pallone, and other distinguished members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today about two new reports from the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General. These reports provide a first look at a critical component of the health insurance marketplaces that were established under the Affordable Care Act: their verification of enrollee eligibility.

Accompanying me today is Joyce Greenleaf, our Regional Inspector General For Evaluation and Inspections. First, I will highlight our report, which responded to a congressional mandate to examine the effectiveness of enrollment procedures and safeguards. Then I will talk about our companion report which addressed a specific risk area: the inconsistency resolution process.

Our mandated work examined and directly tested internal controls at the Federal, California, and Connecticut marketplaces. These controls related to verifying the identity of applicants and

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

application information, determining eligibility of applicants for enrollment in qualified health plans, and maintaining and updating enrollment data. Our period of review for that report was October through December of 2013.

We concluded that the Federal, Connecticut, and California marketplaces had certain procedures in place to verify an applicant's information. However, not all internal controls were effective. The presence of an internal control deficiency does not necessarily mean that applicants were improperly enrolled in health plans or in insurance affordability programs. Other mechanisms exist that may remedy the internal control deficiency. These deficiencies in internal controls may have limited the marketplace's ability to prevent the use of inaccurate or fraudulent eligibility information.

We recommended in this report that CMS and the Connecticut and California marketplaces take actions to improve internal control deficiencies. These include verifying the applicant's identity, determining the applicant's eligibility, and maintaining enrollment data.

For the companion report, we analyzed from a national perspective how marketplaces resolved inconsistencies between applicant self-attested information and other data sources. We obtained data from the State marketplaces from October through December of 2013, and for the Federal marketplace we analyzed data through February of 2014.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

During those time periods, many marketplaces were unable to resolve most inconsistencies. The most common were related to citizenship and income. The Federal marketplace wasn't able to resolve 2.6 million of 2.9 million inconsistencies because the CMS eligibility system was not fully operational.

The ability to resolve inconsistencies varied across the marketplaces. Seven State-based marketplaces reported that they were able to resolve those inconsistencies without delay.

Now, inconsistencies do not necessarily indicate that an applicant provided inaccurate information, nor do inconsistencies equate to errors in enrollment in health plans or insurance affordability programs. However, marketplaces must resolve these inconsistencies to ensure eligibility is accurate.

So, accordingly, we recommended that CMS develop a plan for resolving the inconsistencies in the Federal marketplace. We also recommended that CMS ensure that inconsistencies in State-based marketplaces were resolved according to the Federal requirements.

These are the first two reports in a series related to operations of the marketplaces. We have a substantial body of work underway and planned to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent for their intended purposes in a system that operates effectively and is secure. This work will examine additional critical issues related to eligibility systems, payment accuracy, contract oversight, data security, and

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

consumer protection.

I want to thank you all for your interest and support for the OIG's mission and for the opportunity to discuss our work today. We are happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentlelady for her testimony.

[The prepared joint statement of Ms. Daly and Ms. Greenleaf follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1-1 \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. We will now begin questions and answers, and I will recognize myself 5 minutes for that purpose.

Ms. Daly, on January 1st, 2014, Secretary Sebelius certified to Congress that the exchanges are verifying eligibility. Federal law required this certification before exchange subsidies could be made available. OIG's report states, quote, "As of the first quarter of 2014, the Federal marketplace was unable to resolve about 2.6 million of 2.9 million inconsistencies because the CMS eligibility system was not fully operational," end quote.

Based on these facts, isn't it true that HHS made the certification to Congress before the eligibility system was fully operational?

Ms. Daly. Chairman Pitts, we of course looked at the Secretary's report purely for informational purposes and didn't realize analyze it to understand more about what was behind that, what the Secretary had available for making that certification, so I really can't speak directly to your question. I am sorry.

Mr. Pitts. Although your statement says "because the CMS eligibility system was not fully operational." Do you stand by that statement?

Ms. Daly. Oh, absolutely, sir.

Mr. Pitts. All right. Has CMS provided the OIG a firm timetable when their eligibility verification system will be fully operational?

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Ms. Daly. No, sir, not to my knowledge.

Mr. Pitts. Is it possible that these inconsistencies will not be resolved by the next open enrollment period, which starts in November of 2014?

Ms. Daly. Well, we have work ongoing in that area right now, but I really don't know about any definite timetable, nor when they may be fully operational at that time.

Mr. Pitts. Ms. Greenleaf, did you want to add to that?

Ms. Greenleaf. I would add that in CMS' comments to our report they indicated that they had implemented an interim manual system to address the inconsistencies that they were unable address during the period of our report, and CMS reported to us that it would have an automated system by the end of the summer. We have not followed up as yet, but we do have a tracking system in place to monitor the implementation of the recommendations.

Mr. Pitts. Thank you. The OIG is focusing on several areas of work to conduct oversight over spending under the Affordable Care Act. Understanding that much of the scope of the work is fluid, can you highlight some of the specific areas of work your office intends to focus on?

Ms. Daly. I would be glad to do so, sir. Our office has embarked on a strategic approach to looking at the marketplaces, and we have developed a strategy we refer to as PAECS, and that stands for payment

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

accuracy, eligibility, contracting, and security. And with that, we have a number of work planned and already underway looking at payment accuracy, how accurate are the payments that are going out to insurers, and also we are starting work looking at payments within the context of providing subsidies and things of that nature.

Further, with our eligibility work, this is just the first and other jobs that we have planned and underway to look at eligibility. We started work at other State-based marketplaces to understand what their systems were and then doing additional work at the Federal marketplace also.

For contracting, we are looking at several aspects of the contracting that was involved in development of HealthCare.gov. And then finally with security, we are looking at the information security that is designed to protect the information in these marketplaces.

Mr. Pitts. All right. The OIG report states that the administration did not have effective controls in place to perform basic tasks. Can you elaborate on this and tell us what HHS has done to date to alleviate this problem, either one of you?

Ms. Daly. Well, I would be glad to talk about some of the issues that were in our mandated report. For the Federal marketplace, we found that some Social Security numbers were not always validated through the Social Security Administration, and CMS has advised that they are following up on these issues and trying to identify any

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

particular issues that were causing that from the systemic approach.

With that, also there were the inconsistencies in eligibility data that we had talked about, and we have already identified they said they had put in an interim system and were continuing to address those inconsistencies and that a more formal process will be in place later.

Last, we saw that there was not the system functionality to allow enrollees to update their information that was in the system. CMS advised us in agency comments that they had taken steps to allow the functionality so that that information could be updated. So we have not had a chance to go back and look at how well that is functioning at this time.

Mr. Pitts. Ms. Greenleaf, can you elaborate a little?

Ms. Greenleaf. I would just reiterate what I said previously regarding the inconsistencies. That was the priority concern in the report that dealt with the inconsistencies, and we called on CMS to fix that and make public a plan, and we will be monitoring their response to that through our formal tracking system.

Mr. Pitts. My time has expired.

The chair recognize the ranking member, Mr. Pallone, 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is not a surprise anymore that my Republican colleagues never want to talk about the good news with the Affordable Care Act. Eight

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

million signed up for private plans, 6.7 newly enrolled in Medicaid, 3 million young adults on their parents' plans. The list goes on.

For years now, the GOP have ignored the financial assistance available through the marketplaces. They put out misleading analysis claiming massive premium increases, and they have never once admitted that the vast majority of enrollees will qualify for assistance and that coverage will become extremely affordable.

But here are some facts. This year, tax credits cut the average enrollee premium by 76 percent. The average premium consumers are actually paying for dependable comprehensive coverage is \$82 per month. Seventy percent of people getting financial assistance pay less than \$100 a month. Fifty percent pay less than \$50 per month.

And this is incredible news, and that is why the Republicans of course don't want to talk about it. Instead, they claim there is widespread fraud in who is getting the financial assistance. And the reports our witnesses are discussing today address the eligibility checks on the front end. And as we have heard, an inconsistency does not necessarily mean an individual is getting an incorrect subsidy.

So I will say, Ms. Greenleaf, but whoever can answer, isn't it correct that your report states, quote, "Inconsistencies do not necessarily indicate that an applicant provided inaccurate information or is enrolled in a qualified health plan or is receiving financial assistance inappropriately"?

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Ms. Greenleaf. That is correct. Inconsistencies can occur for both eligible and ineligible applicants.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

An inconsistency on an application should not be a surprise. Automatically checking dozens of pieces of application data against a variety of Federal databases is not a simple thing. In fact, a family of 4 could generate 21 different inconsistencies on their application. And that is why the lead contractor responsible for resolving these inconsistencies said he was not surprised by the number of inconsistencies.

If the consumer includes a hyphen in their name on their application which does not appear in Federal databases, that could generate an inconsistency. If the consumer had recently moved, that might generate an inconsistency. But those are clearly not examples of fraud or misrepresentation. They are harmless. Similarly, with regard to income, the marketplace checks individual income off of 2012 tax data, so it would not be a surprise if their 2014 income data was different than 2012.

Again, Ms. Greenleaf, isn't it true that an income inconsistency does not necessarily mean an individual is getting too much or too little financial assistance?

Ms. Greenleaf. It doesn't necessarily mean that, no. As I mentioned previously, both eligible and ineligible applicants can have

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

inconsistencies, and the law anticipated the existence of inconsistencies. What is concerning is the number of unresolved inconsistencies.

Mr. Pallone. Okay. Now, again, CMS has resolved more than 460,000 inconsistencies and has a process in place to resolve the remaining inconsistencies this summer. So, Ms. Greenleaf, CMS concurred with your recommendation to make public their plan to resolve inconsistencies. Isn't that correct?

Ms. Greenleaf. We have not received CMS' official response outside of what is in the actual report yet, so they have a certain amount of time to respond to the recommendations officially. In its comments to our report, they did indicate the interim manual system and later this summer to fully automate, so we will be monitoring that closely through our formal tracking system.

Mr. Pallone. And isn't it correct that in their response to your recommendations they wrote, and I quote, "The FFM now has in place an interim manual process that allows it to reconcile inconsistencies and plans to implement the automated functionality this summer"?

Ms. Greenleaf. CMS did say that in its response to our report.

Mr. Pallone. I am just pleased that the IG is monitoring the agency's work, but the progress CMS has made to address these issues is important.

And I guess, look, I am just so frustrated by the fact that the

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Republicans are ignoring all this in order to score political points. I mean, again, we are talking about middle-class people here. We are talking about someone who is trying to fill out a form. We are talking about people whose income is, what, \$25,000, \$30,000 to \$80,000 or \$90,000 for a family of four. This is the middle class that supposedly all of us want to build and provide a decent healthcare benefit package for.

I am not saying we shouldn't have the hearing, obviously, but I just think that there is so much emphasis on the GOP side on the fact that some average person is going to commit fraud, and that is not the case here. This is not a huge problem that is being presented.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman.

Now recognize the gentlelady from North Carolina, Mrs. Ellmers, 5 minutes for questions.

Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Ms. Daly and Ms. Greenleaf, for being with us today.

Your study shows that 85 percent have not been resolved, and that is an incredibly large number of applicants' application process that is in question. And that certainly doesn't mean that there was fraud perpetrated. It just means that there are inconsistencies and those inconsistencies need to be addressed. And it goes to the larger problem of eligibility and how are we ensuring the American taxpayers

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

their hard-earned dollars are being utilized to the best possible. And we want to see everyone have affordable health care. We need to make sure that it is done right. And starting at this point is a good place.

So I guess what I need to know is, what happens now? I mean, what happens? I know that you said, Ms. Daly, you talked about a formal tracking system going into place, which that is very, very good, making sure that payments that are going out are accurate and being accounted for. But then in relation to those who might be in a situation of getting subsidies that might not have qualified, how can we address that issue? I am glad that there is a tracking system in place for the payments, but how is that going to help us get to the bottom of the issue?

And, Ms. Greenleaf, I would like for you to weigh in as well, if you would like.

Ms. Daly. Well, thank you very much for that question.

I think the inconsistency periods, that was set up as part of the law and the regulations surrounding ACA because, indeed, there can be some variations in some of the information. So it gives an opportunity to try to clarify all that.

During that period, people are conditionally enrolled in the program until that is cleared up. I think the rules state that if there does turn out to be a case where perhaps someone may have gotten a subsidy that they were not entitled to of whatever nature, financial

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

assistance of whatever nature, there are plans in place for obtaining resolution on that. So that, for example, with the tax credit, that would be worked out when the consumer files their tax return next year, and this is all supposed to be reconciled at that point in time.

Mrs. Elmers. How would it be reconciled, though, because basically aren't they paying a certain premium amount or getting a certain tax credit at that level? Because would they or would they not be paying more for their healthcare coverage if there is an inconsistency that is found to be accurate, essentially meaning that they did find the inconsistency? How do you make up that difference?

Ms. Greenleaf.

Ms. Greenleaf. I think that happens, it is my understanding, through the reconciliation process with the IRS. So it could be that some applicants would be owed money and others would in fact owe money. So it could be determined either way. They come fully enrolled during the 90-day inconsistency period, after which a redetermination is supposed to be made.

Mrs. Elmers. Okay. And then I guess there again, from what you are saying, the IRS then becomes the enforcing body that will make sure that this happens.

Ms. Daly. That is my understanding, yes.

Mrs. Elmers. Okay.

Well, thank you.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

And I really, Mr. Chairman, I don't have anymore questions, so I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

Now recognize the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Green, 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Pallone and our witnesses for their testimony today.

I am going to echoing my colleagues: Inconsistencies are not the same as errors or fraud. It is incorrect and deliberately misleading or refer to them that way. According to John Lau, vice president of Serco, the contractor responsible for obtaining the necessary information to address enrollment inconsistencies, 99 percent of the inconsistencies in marketplace applications are innocuous.

And it is also disingenuous to suggest such inconsistencies are specific to the Affordable Care Act. Federal and State programs where eligibility must be verified, such as Medicaid, all face the challenges of reconciling inconsistent data in applications. However, in Medicaid eligible applicants are put on a waiting list while the discrepancy is sorted out, forced to go without health coverage for however long it takes. Under the ACA, Americans can enroll and get coverage immediately.

The inconsistencies, which I repeat are 99 percent innocuous in ACA applications, are going to be resolved at some point, but we feel

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

it is better for people to get coverage after applying instead of going on a waiting list indefinitely.

Ms. Daly and Ms. Greenleaf, other Federal programs have to verify individuals' eligibility through an application process. Isn't this correct?

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir.

Mr. Green. Okay. So inconsistencies in applications are not unique to exchanges created under the Affordable Care Act?

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir.

Mr. Green. Thank you.

In the Medicaid program, eligible applicants are put on a waiting list until their inconsistency is fixed and an applicant can access coverage. That is partly why we have a massive backlog in Medicaid applications in States around the country. That is not a solution at all. Given the unknown nature of health care, you never know when you will need it. It is long overdue that we move beyond efforts to undermine, repeal, or create unwarranted alarm for political gain about the ACA and get back to the business of serving the American people.

I have some time left. Can you give me examples of other programs that maybe the GAO has investigated that you go back in and have inconsistencies?

Ms. Daly. I am sorry, but just nothing is coming to mind at this point in time. But I would be glad to get back with you on that.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Green. Okay. If you would and share it.

Ms. Greenleaf. Nothing comes to my mind either. Thank you. We can get back to you if we identify anything.

[The information follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Green. Were there any specific recommendations that either of your agencies made to Health and Human Services to correct some of the problems?

Ms. Daly. In our report, sir, we had identified a number of weaknesses at both the Federal, Connecticut, and California marketplaces, and we made specific recommendations to fix the underlying systems, of course, that were prompting such errors, and then we also asked them to fix the specific cases that we had found. And they were generally amenable doing so, so that was very helpful.

Mr. Green. Have you followed up with that to see both on the national exchange and the Connecticut and California if that is what they are doing if they agreed to correct those inconsistencies?

Ms. Daly. Well, we do have work that we are getting underway right now to do additional work at the Federal exchange to look at some other issues there and plan, as part of that, to do additional follow-up on the status of the recommendations we had made in this report.

Mr. Green. Okay. So this is not something that we are going to sweep under the rug, we want to deal with it, because, again, the ACA is a valuable tool for people in our country to get health care, and we want to make sure it is done right. And I appreciate your agencies for doing that, and hopefully Congress will get back to what we want to do, is make sure it gets done right.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield back my time.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman.

Now recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Lance, 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Lance. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

This committee has spent a great deal of time and effort discussing the inadequacies of the healthcare law's rollout. Some people believe that the worse is behind us and many of the most important serious problems have been resolved. However, I believe, as your report has pointed out, many of our constituents may be in for a rude awakening when their tax bill comes due.

I am also greatly concerned, and this is not an area for you to address, but I wish to place on the record the fact that there is the significant constitutional and statutory issue regarding subsidies for the Federal exchange as opposed to subsidies for the State exchanges. That issue will be resolved in the courts. I did ask Secretary Sebelius about that very significant matter at a previous hearing, and let me predict that that case is likely to go to the Supreme Court, although it is now in the various circuits.

Regarding the issue this morning, it is my understanding that you did not review certain eligibility issues because you did not have access to Federal taxpayer information at the time of your audit. Would you please update the committee on your access to that information now? Ms. Daly.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir. Yes, as we were performing our work, we learned that you could not have the access to the Federal taxpayer data. So we immediately began to discuss the issue with IRS and have worked very closely with them. They have been very agreeable in helping us sort through the issues.

At this time we have been advised that we can access the Federal taxpayer information that is provided to the Federal marketplace, and so that is going to be one of the key areas we are following up on to do the similar work that we had done looking at other aspects of determining eligibility to also look at verifying the income. And with that, we are also continuing to discuss with IRS obtaining access to the State marketplaces, too.

Mr. Lance. And do either of those matters require statutory change or can you do that administratively?

Ms. Daly. Well, to date, we have had success in doing that administratively, but if it looks like we may need to have a statutory change, we would be glad to get back and work with you and your staffs to try to bring about such a change.

Mr. Lance. Do you have a timeframe, Ms. Daly, when you will receive that information regarding both the Federal exchange and the State exchanges with the IRS?

Ms. Daly. Well, for the Federal exchange we have received the authorization to go in and review that. We are just going through some

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

more logistic issues of ensuring that we have appropriate safeguards in place to protect that taxpayer data while it is in our possession.

And for the timeframe, for completing the work on the Federal exchange, I believe it is in the spring of 2015 we should have the results out on that assessment there. And with the States, we are continuing to work with them, so I can't provide you with an assessment right then of when that may be available.

Mr. Lance. Thank you. I hope you are able to provide us with that when you do get that information.

Regarding the fact that the Federal exchange information with the IRS may be available in the spring of 2015, next spring, I wish to make sure that my constituents understand the implications of these problems that were highlighted in your report. If the eligibility verification system produces a determination for an applicant with an inaccurate exchange subsidy, am I accurate that the IRS is required by law to claw back that money from the individual?

Ms. Daly. Sir, if you are referring to the tax credits and so forth, yes, sir, that would be part of the IRS' responsibility.

And I would also like, if I could, to take a second to clarify that our work that we plan to be doing at the Federal exchange, that is when we would have completed the work, would be in the spring of 2015, so we can provide the results at that time to the august members of this body.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Lance. Thank you. I am not suggesting necessarily that there is fraud on the part of those who may have provided inaccurate information. I would imagine in most cases it is not a matter of fraud, it simply may be a matter of inaccurate information. And all of us as human, we all make mistakes.

I do believe that there is a potential that there are going to be many unhappy surprises come tax time next spring, in the spring of 2015. Only time will tell. But certainly that impresses me as being a possibility.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman.

Now recognize the gentlelady from Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky, 5 minutes for questions.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement and a request to make. I hope I will still have time for some questions.

But we have had a lot of good news about the Affordable Care Act in recent weeks: 8 million enrolled in private coverage, 6.7 million enrolled in Medicaid, the number of uninsured dropping by 10 million people, and the rate of uninsured in States around the country dropping by 30, 40, even 50 percent in just 1 year. Actually that is pretty amazing. And I want to put two articles in the record that discuss some of this good news and what I believe is the warped Republican reaction to it.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

The first is a column in the New York Times. The columnist writes, quote, "What you get whenever you suggest that things are going okay with the ACA, there is an outpouring not so much of disagreement as of fury. People get red in the face, angry, practically to the point of incoherence over the suggestion that it is not a disaster," unquote. He goes on to say, quote, "I suspect there is now an element of shame if this thing is actually working. Everyone who yelled about how it would be a disaster ends up looking fairly stupid," unquote.

The next piece I want to highlight is from health reporter Sarah Kliff, who listed out, quote, "7 Predicted Obamacare Disasters That Never Happened," unquote. Here is the list. One, the Web site will never work. Two, nobody wants to buy coverage. Three, the ACA would not meet enrollment goals. Four, only people who already had coverage are signing up. Five, there would be a net loss of insurance. Six, premiums will skyrocket. And finally, seven, that the law just won't work. People won't get doctors' visits, insurers will drop out, et cetera.

And, Mr. Chairman, each and every one of these predictions has proven flat wrong. Ten million people have gained coverage this year because of the ACA. Surveys indicate that they like their coverage. There are none of the increased wait times or skyrocketing premiums Republicans claimed, especially when you factor in the financial assistance that is available. More and more insurers are

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

participating in the marketplaces next year, increasing choice and competition.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put these two articles in the record.

Mr. Pitts. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you.

And I just want to say about this hearing, if this were a good faith effort to really find and fix some of the problems that are in the Affordable Care Act, I would be more than happy to fully participate in every way in those kinds of efforts. Anybody knows that such an ambitious piece of legislation is going to have to be tweaked. I don't think anybody would disagree that there aren't ways that we can make this better. But time after time in this committee what we do is look for ways to simply attack the law, suggesting that it is just horrendous, it is unworkable, when we know that it is helping millions and millions of people. Seventy-four percent of Republicans who have signed up said they like that.

I would say that is pretty good. I mean, there is still a quarter of the people who say that they are not happy. Let's figure out why and try and make that better. But I don't feel like this is the spirit of these hearings. We are talking now about lawsuits are going to go to the Supreme Court. We could as a Congress, as a committee, address some of these problems and actually suggest changes that we could vote out and then present to the full House of Representatives and make those things better and work.

Our ranking member expressed frustration, and I feel that, too. The reason that I am in public service is because my hope was that at the end of my career I could say that I helped provide health care to

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

all Americans. What could be more basic than wanting to do that. Is that really what my colleagues across the aisle are looking for or is it to nitpick and ultimately sue?

I mean, think about this lawsuit that is being considered today. We are talking about the President being sued for not enforcing the Affordable Care Act, that hated law by the Republicans, for not enforcing it fully, and for not enforcing, they are saying, a provision that perhaps was the most hated, the employer mandate. So I am just really, really confused.

I am sorry. I appreciate the witnesses. I appreciate that you are looking into these problems and trying to help us solve them. That, to me, ought to be the goal of all of us here.

And I yield back.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

And now recognize the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Guthrie, 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the ranking member. And I thank the witnesses for being here today.

It is not just providing the information that has to be checked as well. I have heard from multiple groups that represent employers that haven't been notified a single time by CMS, as required by law, that an employee has received an advanceable premium tax credit. And I understand the process is supposed to work is that CMS should be

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

verifying up front whether the employee has access to affordable coverage prior to authorizing a subsidy, and to me, this step is critical. As we know, certain coverage offered by an employer would make individuals ineligible for tax credits.

Do you see how this process was working? Or was it working? My understanding, employers are not being contacted to see if they offer affordable coverage.

Ms. Daly. Well, yes, sir, that was part of the audit work that we did in performing our tests, and as part of that, of course, it varied across the marketplaces how that worked. For the Federal marketplace, they were checking other Federal organizations such as to determine whether there was coverage offered for, like, with OPM, with the Department of Defense, and other places that offer health insurance. For other cases, there would be attestation, bringing in information from the employer to do that check itself.

Mr. Guthrie. Is that happening the way it should be happening? I know what is supposed to happen. How is it happening? Yeah, I am sorry.

Ms. Daly. No, perfectly fine. No, that is actually how it is happening now because the issue is that there is no national database in which you could quickly go check, so that was the approach that was taken.

Mr. Guthrie. Well, the problem is, if it is done inaccurately,

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

then employers, as a couple of my colleagues have said, then employees will be receiving thousands of dollars of inaccurate tax credits, and they will be required, as we established earlier, to pay back.

I read the report, too, I went to the report, and I understand what you are saying, they were trying to make this provision work, but it doesn't seem to have a good way to do it, and therefore we are going to have people have being ineligible to receive credits they are receiving, and they are going to have to pay it back. Like I said, not in any malice are they doing it. They are just following, hey, I can sign up for health care. I have heard it in on the TV, radio, if you are in Kentucky, see it on billboards, and they go sign up, and if it is not verified, then later on they will have to pay back.

And I said, they are not doing it on purpose, but that can happen to them, and it is a lot of money to have to pay back at one time when they find that.

So as we move forward, you are doing further tests, I think that is an area you really need to look at. Do you have, Ms. Greenleaf, any comments on that process?

Ms. Greenleaf. I don't have anything to add to that.

Mr. Guthrie. Okay. Well, thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman.

Now recognize the vice chair of the full committee, Mrs. Blackburn, 5 minutes for questions.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you all for being here. We have got an interesting hearing going on downstairs also, as you all are probably aware, with the problems with the HHS CDC labs, et cetera. So I have been back and forth from that.

I think that as we talk about this verification system it is important to remind everybody that Secretary Sebelius, on January 1, 2014, certified, verified that the exchanges were indeed verifying eligibility. And while the Secretary certified a verification system, there is still no real system in place. And even HHS, the watchdog, reports that the administration does not have effective controls in place to perform basic tasks, such as validating Social Security numbers, correctly identifying applicants, and verifying citizenship. And, again, this has not been corrected.

So for some of us who have lived through some of the government-run healthcare programs, and for Mr. Pallone's benefit I always have to bring up TennCare, because it thrills him when I bring up TennCare and the failed experiment in Tennessee with government-run health care. And if Congressman Green wanted examples of inconsistencies and how they were or were not dealt with, I can give him a laundry list. And so I am sure Mr. Pallone will have him come talk to me about those.

But I find it so curious, and Ms. Daly, I will come to you, how do you certify a verification system when there really isn't a

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

verification system in place, and what are the detailed, step-by-step components of this verified, certified verification system?

Ms. Daly. Okay. Well, with that the Secretary was responsible for providing such a certification on the report -- I am sorry, on the system that was in place -- and it did indeed provide one. Now, we haven't reviewed that report in detail. We did use it for informational purposes to learn more about the regulations and law and so forth that was in there. So I can't really speak to what the Secretary relied on or used for making such a certification.

Mrs. Blackburn. Well, let me ask you this. Ms. Greenleaf, does it make sense that you would certify a verification system when you didn't have a verification system?

Ms. Greenleaf. I am not familiar with the process that the Secretary used to take a look at that system.

Mrs. Blackburn. So what you are telling me is there is no standard operating procedure or there are no benchmarks, there are no written expectations for what the system will be. Is that correct, Ms. Greenleaf?

Ms. Greenleaf. I am not familiar with what the benchmarks or systems for operation would be for that.

Mrs. Blackburn. Ms. Daly.

Ms. Daly. Yes, Congresswoman. Yes, there are regulations that are in place that went through the full vetting process that all Federal

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

regulations go through for determining what is appropriate to have in such a system. They help in designing the system.

Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. So you have got regulations.

Ms. Daly. Uh-huh.

Mrs. Blackburn. Do you have a plan for a full end-to-end system for verification processing?

Mrs. Blackburn. There was a plan that was put in place for determining the system.

Mrs. Blackburn. Is it active and operational?

Ms. Daly. Well, there is a system that is operational at this time.

Mrs. Blackburn. Is it functioning?

Ms. Daly. Our report identified that some of the controls in that system were functioning as they were planned to do so within the --

Mrs. Blackburn. Some were?

Ms. Daly. Some were, some were not.

Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. So still, they don't have their verifications processes in place end to end?

Ms. Daly. That would be fair, yes, because we identified some that weren't operating as they should at that point in time.

Mrs. Blackburn. So as long as we have that failure, that systemic failure, we cannot certify that the subsidies are working appropriately and people that are receiving taxpayer money -- and this is something,

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

I think, everybody needs to remember. This is not Federal Government money that is making the subsidies. It is taxpayer money that is sent to the Federal Government by hard-working taxpayers that is going into these subsidies, into a system that does not have a verification process in place end to end.

In Tennessee, when it didn't work, Democrat governor had to come in and remove 300,000 people from the program -- 300,000. Now, you say that times 50, and you see the problems we are going to be up against because we don't know who is getting the money.

I yield back.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

Now recognize the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Griffith, 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Griffith. Ms. Daly, I am going to pick up a little bit where Mrs. Blackburn left off, and appreciate her questions. The administration, when dealing with criticisms about the implementation of the Web site, likes to come back and say, well, it is better now, and in October they did not have a fully operational back-end eligibility system. And yes or no, based on your testimony here today, it sounds like to me they do not currently have a fully operational back-end eligibility system, isn't that correct, yes or no?

Ms. Daly. It depends on the time. The timeframe that we looked at covered the period through December of 2013, so that is what we

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

focused on.

Mr. Griffith. Okay. But you indicated that some were working and some weren't, but it is not working right now completely, isn't that correct?

Ms. Daly. I can't speak to what is working right now, sir. I am sorry.

Mr. Griffith. All right. But if they did have a system, you wouldn't have expected the document from CMS to have been released last month indicating the number of individuals enrolled in the exchange plan. And when the committee received that document, if you could read the part, I believe it has been given to you, or Ms. Greenleaf, on page 3 of that document provided by CMS to the committee. And that last statement says, if you would read that for us, please?

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir, I did receive that document, and I just wanted to acknowledge that I have not had a chance to analyze this, and these aren't the IG's data, by any means. But I would be glad to read it for you.

Mr. Griffith. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Daly. "Current data indicates that 2.1 million people who are enrolled in a qualified health plan, or QHP, as it states on the document, are affected by 1 or more inconsistency."

Mr. Griffith. All right. Now, if there was in fact a fully operational back-end eligibility system on January 1, we should not

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

have this problem, isn't that correct, yes or no? On January 1.

Ms. Daly. I would say that that would be a fair statement, that we would have a fully operational system on January 1, and our work showed that that was not in place.

Mr. Griffith. That was not in place. And so then when Secretary Sebelius certified to Congress that that system did in fact work, she would have been mistaken, isn't that correct?

Ms. Daly. I really can't respond to that.

Mr. Griffith. I am not asking you whether she was doing anything intentional or whether she was given bad information. I am just saying she said it worked, it didn't work, you know it doesn't work, therefore she had to be mistaken, isn't that correct?

Ms. Daly. Well, I think the issue is that the --

Mr. Griffith. It is yes or no, either she was mistaken or she was correct. If she was correct, it worked fine. You have already told us it didn't work fine, so the answer should be yes, shouldn't it?

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

RPTS BAKER

DCMN WILTSIE

[11:13 a.m.]

Ms. Daly. Well, I think what --

Mr. Griffith. I know you don't want to say she was mistaken. But wasn't she mistaken?

Ms. Daly. Well, I would have to read very carefully how that certification was worded. Quite frankly, I have not done so.

Mr. Griffith. All right. That being said, let me take a minute, Mr. Chairman, if I might, to respond to some of the things that were said earlier about the Obamacare not being a disaster.

My constituents feel it is a disaster. Let me go through a few of the things that were raised in the point by the gentlelady previously.

Talking about the suit for the President, she indicated that we were suing the President for not going forward with Obamacare in parts that we didn't care for. While that is true, the real reason for the suit is that the President is not faithfully executing the laws passed by Congress.

Whether I like the law or not, the President ought to execute the laws passed by Congress and not suspend the law and then re-insert his own legislation into that.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Further, I would say, Mr. Chairman, she said that, you know, we could fix it. I would submit that Dr. Frankenstein couldn't fix his monster. We are not capable of fixing Obamacare.

For people who she said the premiums are not skyrocketing, I don't know about her district, but in my district, people are finding that their premiums are going up at a substantial rate. They would tell me -- and they do on a regular basis -- that it is, in fact, skyrocketing.

And then, you know, she said that it was working. Look, for my folks -- and I represent what I call the cornucopia of Virginia, that part that comes out of the deep southwest and spills out into the rest of the State.

We border the states of North Carolina, West Virginia, Tennessee and Kentucky. We have split cities in two, Bluefield, Virginia/West Virginia, and Bristol, Virginia/Tennessee, where the main commerce street is State Street and the line is right down the middle of the main street of commerce.

But you can't go to a hospital if you live on one side of State Street that is more than one county out if you are in the Obama plan. You can't go to a hospital in West Virginia.

You can't go -- if you live in Martinsville or in Galax, Virginia, you can't go to Bowman Gray in North Carolina or Duke any longer. You want to say a system is working when people have been able to go to teaching hospitals in the past and now they have to drive a lot farther

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

to get to one because of Obamacare. It is not working.

I submit that the gentlelady in that case was wrong as well. And I yield back.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman and now recognizes the gentlelady from Washington, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, for 5 minutes for questions.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I appreciate you both being here today.

I wanted just to reinforce before I went to my question that the administration didn't make a pledge to prevent fraudulent payments.

The law states that only certain individuals are able to qualify for subsidies and that they must be able to prove citizenship. And it is just another example of the administration ignoring the rule of law.

My questions. First, the secretary has refused to release any more enrollment reports after the one they released in May.

Do you think continuing the issuing of these reports to Congress and public would be helpful?

Ms. Daly. I am not certain that the secretary is compelled to do so under any law or anything of that --

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Do you think it would be helpful?

Ms. Daly. I think it would be helpful.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Okay. Thank you.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

After your analysis of the Federal marketplace and the two State marketplaces, do you think these exchanges are able to start reporting on who has actually been paying their premiums?

Ms. Daly. I am sorry. I am not in a position to answer that at this time on the current status of what is going on at the marketplaces.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Do you know how soon we will have a sense as to who is actually paying their premiums in these exchanges?

Ms. Daly. Well, we do have a variety of work that is planned and underway looking at further operations of the marketplaces, but I think we are going to be looking at the State marketplaces.

We have already got that work started on the ones we had not already reviewed, and that work is going to be coming out probably sometime in the winter and spring of next year. And it could be -- because there are quite a few, there is a number of reports that will be coming on that.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Is it the goal to better clarify actually who has been paying premiums and not? Is that going to be part of the goal?

Ms. Daly. Well, I think who is paying the premiums on the insurance -- we are looking at this time at how the premiums that are being paid -- if they are going to the right insurers, you know.

But whether the insuree, the person that has gotten the insurance, is making their premium payments is not an issue that we had focused

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

on at this time.

But we would be glad to work with your staff to understand more about, you know, some of the implications surrounding that and see if we can, you know, get the resources to work that into our work plan.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Now, I know that your report focused on the Federal marketplace and the State marketplaces in Connecticut and California.

However, I represent Washington State. And I was curious as to the extent of OIG's office and their monitoring of the State exchanges beyond California and Connecticut.

Recently the Washington healthplanfinder -- that is our exchange -- had to explain to customers why some of them received an August invoice for twice the amount they owed.

Now, you think about the impact on the middle class and the uncertainty that they face and the confusion that they continue to face and whether or not they are paying double their premiums or not. Others received no invoice. And some received an invoice with a zero balance, even though they owed a monthly premium.

So are there procedures in place in Washington and other State marketplaces to quickly remedy these types of errors?

Ms. Daly. Unfortunately, our work hasn't looked at that particular issue at this point in time. So I am sorry. I can't respond directly to your question.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Well, is the Office of Inspector General ever going to look at this question as to who is actually paying these premiums and whether or not it is accurate?

These are hardworking middle-class families quite often that are in need of health insurance, are trying to, you know, figure out how to stretch their paychecks to pay for oftentimes increasing premiums.

Are we ever going to assure them that they are actually paying accurate premiums? Or how are we going to address when there is a double bill and those kind of issues?

Ms. Daly. Well, those are important issues. And, again, we would be glad to work with you and your staff to help see if we can design some work that would be able to address those areas of concern.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. So my final question.

What is going to happen to someone when they are either confused or they accidentally don't pay or if they pay double, whatever the situation? Are they going to be cut from coverage or will they receive a refund? How is this going to be remedied?

Ms. Daly. I am sorry. If you could just help clarify for me --

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Okay. My question is: You are an individual. You have either been charged double or maybe you accidentally didn't pay. How is this going to be remedied?

Ms. Daly. Right. I am just not positioned to respond to that today simply because our work hasn't focused in that particular area

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

as yet. So --

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Is there a plan to ever address these questions?

Ms. Daly. I just don't have any information available for you at this time, but we would be glad to try to get back with you on that.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. And the weeks go by and individuals are out there still looking for answers, too.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

I now recognize the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. Gingrey, 5 minutes.

Dr. Gingrey. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

I haven't been here for the entire hearing because we have one going on concurrently downstairs, very important as well, but the little bit that I have heard since I have been here really disturbs me.

My term in Congress -- my 12th year, my 6th term -- will come to an end at the end of the 113th Congress. I am looking for something else to do and I think I am going to apply for a job as an Inspector General in the Federal Government because the hours seem good and, obviously, there is no heavy lifting.

Your responses so far, both of you, have indicated to me that you don't seem to really be on the ball in regard to Inspector-Generaling

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

in a non-biased, unbiased way, which is what you are supposed to be doing.

And when I talk to the people in the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, there is no way that I can give them any confidence that you are doing your job so that people who are undeserving, unqualified to receive part of the million -- excuse me -- trillion dollars' worth of subsidies in this ultra-expensive program are getting to the right people.

So let me specifically ask you -- and you can comment on my comments as well -- but the OIG's work has revealed a number of problems, as I have heard this morning, in CMS's process of verifying whether an individual is eligible for part of the estimated \$1 trillion in exchange subsidies that will be spent over the next 10 years.

And I would like to ask if OIG has found problems in resolving inconsistencies in the following areas: An applicant's Social Security number, an applicant's legal status, an applicant's income and all these income set-asides that exist by virtue of waivers in the Medicaid program and everything across the various and sundry 50 States and territories, other sources of coverage for an applicant, such as employer-sponsored income.

Can you give us a little insight on any of that? And, for goodness' sakes, isn't that what you are supposed to be looking at?

Ms. Greenleaf. Thank you for the question.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

In fact, when we looked at the marketplaces, we did find problems with their abilities to resolve inconsistencies in all those areas that you identified. The most common inconsistencies that were not resolved did concern citizenship and income.

You had also mentioned Social Security number. There was some ability of the Federal marketplace to resolve those, but, in the end, the marketplace resolved very few.

So these inconsistencies don't necessarily equate to an improper enrollment or an improper subsidy, but they are concerning, and we made recommendations that CMS resolve these and make its plan public on how and when it will do so.

Dr. Gingrey. Well, have they made that public? You made the recommendations that they do so. But as far as you know to this point --

Ms. Greenleaf. We are tracking their response. In their comments to our report, CMS indicated that it had implemented an interim manual process to resolve inconsistencies and was making progress, and we will be following up with them in a formal way to track their responses over the next couple of months.

Dr. Gingrey. Well, I don't have any other questions.

Ms. Daly, did you want to respond to that as well?

Ms. Daly. No, sir. But thank you for the opportunity. I think Ms. Greenleaf did a fine job.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Dr. Gingrey. Well, yeah. She did okay.

Honestly, Mr. Chairman, I think we would have done well this morning to have somebody from GAO here as well to tell us what kind of a job they think the Office of Inspector General is doing in regard to this program.

Look, I am not picking on the witnesses. I mean, this is an opportunity for us to get information. There are people out there that need and deserve these subsidies.

After all, the PPACA was put in place for the supposedly 15- to 20 million people who through no fault of their own couldn't afford health insurance because of low income.

And, yet, if we have got people gaming the system, other people are suffering because of it. They are not on the program, maybe.

And then those that are not eligible for a subsidy, it just simply means that their premiums, their deductibles, their co-pay, are going through the roof, and they are just going to throw up their hands and say, "I am not going to buy into the system. I will pay the fine and go bare."

And I, as a physician, know how bad that is. We don't want that to happen. So that is why I am being a little hard on the witnesses, but I don't think too hard.

And I thank them for being here this morning.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman and now recognize the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bilirakis. 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This report that the IG issued is troubling to me. It is further evidence that the administration wasn't ready --

Mr. Pitts. You want to pull your mic down a little bit.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you.

The 2.6 million unresolved inconsistencies existed before the CMS's eligibility system was not fully operational. This means that people may have received a subsidy that they are not legally entitled to or people could be receiving too much. When they file their taxes next year, people could receive a shock when they have to repay parts of their subsidy to the government.

I knew that this system was not going to work. I knew that it was broken. Last year I introduced the No Taxation Without Verification Act. My bill would have prevented any tax provisions from being implemented until there was a working verification system in place.

It wasn't enough that the administration had a process. They should have to meet certain metrics, in my opinion. Unfortunately and predictably, the administration made a mess of verification, in my opinion, and the entire back end of the Web site, just like they made a mess, in my opinion, of the healthcare.gov.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Ultimately, this hurts the American taxpayer. That is the bottom line. And I do have a couple questions.

In the OIG report, you recommend that CMS develop a public plan and set a deadline to clear the current backlog of inconsistencies and resolve the problems.

When does CMS -- this is the question: When does CMS need to have the plan and deadline release to address these pressing problems?

And do you think it is necessary to provide time to test the verification changes in the system before the next open enrollment period begins?

Ms. Greenleaf. We will be tracking -- we have a formal tracking system for monitoring CMS's response to our recommendations.

So over the next couple of months -- I believe within six months they have to have a formal plan back to us, though it could well be sooner.

Mr. Bilirakis. Are you going to press them?

Ms. Greenleaf. Yeah. We will be following up both formally and informally. The Office of Inspector General leadership meets regularly with the CMS leadership.

And this is a high-priority recommendation, and the bottom line is inconsistencies need to be resolved so we can have confidence that the determinations about eligibility are accurate.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Next question. The OIG reports that applicants are given a 90-day period to resolve inconsistencies after a notice is sent to a consumer.

This 90-day period can be extended, generally, by the secretary, but cannot be extended in instances involving citizenship and immigration status.

Do you know if HHS is holding applicants to this standard? Can you answer that question first.

Ms. Greenleaf. That was a little bit outside the scope of our review.

And you are correct. There is the 90-day inconsistency period during which an applicant can lawfully enroll, and the inconsistency is supposed to be resolved during that time.

But we did not collect information on how often it is being extended or whether -- you know, how that is being managed at the marketplaces.

Mr. Bilirakis. Do you have -- Ms. Daly, can you respond to that?

Ms. Daly. No, sir. I am sorry. I can't add anything to that either.

Mr. Bilirakis. Well, I have another question. I would like to get this information from you immediately, I mean, within the next couple days, please.

Is HHS actually terminating coverage, if you can answer that, or

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

withdrawing subsidies if an applicant has failed to provide documentation to address an inconsistency regarding citizenship or legal status within the 90-day period? Can you try to respond to that, please.

Ms. Greenleaf. I think we will have to get back to you on that to try and answer that. I don't have that information.

Mr. Bilirakis. So you are not sure?

Ms. Greenleaf. That is correct.

Mr. Bilirakis. Is that correct, Ms. Daly? You are not sure?

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir. I am not certain at this time.

Mr. Bilirakis. Please get back to us. This is vital. I really would appreciate it. Thank you very much.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pitts. Chair thanks the gentleman.

Now recognize the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. Cassidy, 5 minutes for questions.

Dr. Cassidy. Hello. I am sorry to have come in late. So people may have asked my questions. I apologize.

Looking at your testimony on pages 3 and 4, I gather a sample was done of California, Connecticut, the Federal exchange, a sample of 45.

Now, as best as I can tell on Page 4, the second bullet point refers specifically to California. Verifying citizenship, 7 out of 45, it was unclear that their citizenship was verified.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

I gather that is 15 percent of those in California who signed up we cannot confirm that they are U.S. citizens. Is that a correct reading of this?

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir. That finding indicates that, of the 45 applicants that we selected for sampling in California, 7 of those 45 did not have their information run through the system as it was supposed to occur.

Dr. Cassidy. Now, I am told that California had roughly 1.5 million people sign up through their Cover California exchange.

So potentially 15 percent of those, or 225,000, were not citizens, potentially?

Ms. Daly. I would caution against --

Dr. Cassidy. Accept that.

Ms. Daly. -- trying to extrapolate those results. The type of sampling that we did wasn't the type that you could use for extrapolation purposes. It was simply to provide a "yes" or "no" answer. Was the action done? Yes or no.

Dr. Cassidy. But it was a random sample, I presume.

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir.

Dr. Cassidy. So as a random sample, theoretically, representative of the whole -- granted, maybe they just didn't provide -- but, nonetheless, potentially as many as 15 percent of those who signed up through California were not citizens, potentially. Fair

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

statement?

Ms. Daly. Well, given the type of sampling that we have done, I can't make that extrapolation.

Dr. Cassidy. There is a margin of error.

Ms. Daly. Yeah.

Dr. Cassidy. There is a margin of error, but nonetheless -- so this being the case -- wow -- have you done a follow-up sample, larger and more statistically significant?

Ms. Daly. At this time we have not had an opportunity to follow up with California on this.

Dr. Cassidy. Now, Ms. Daly, that just seems to beg to be done. I mean, if it a potential -- granted, a small sample size with a large margin of error.

But if 15 percent of the people may not be citizens, that actually seems like kind of moves up list of follow-up actions taken on this sample size. Am I missing something?

Ms. Daly. Well, sir, I think it is really important to recognize that this was a system design issue, and I think California told us that they were following up to try to get that addressed.

And I think that is an important point to make, that when there is a systemic issue where it is a problem with the programming --

Dr. Cassidy. California actually has a vested interest in, frankly, not addressing this because the subsidy is coming from the

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

United States taxpayer, not -- you know, in general, not just Californians. So as I am also told, 90 percent of those who signed up on California exchanges received subsidies.

Now, if that's the case, again, just back of envelope, that means over 200,000 people on the California exchange potentially are receiving generous subsidies and they are not citizens.

Now, that seems more kind of the purview of the Federal Government as an overseer as opposed to the Californians, who may not care. Again, am I missing something?

Ms. Daly. Well, I just -- the point is that, you know, our -- again, our sampling approach was more of a compliance sample in which you are either identified as yes or no, you meet that or not meet that.

Dr. Cassidy. I accept that. You have explained that methodology.

But I am -- we have got hardworking taxpayers who are barely making it and who -- we were told by those who promoted this that only citizens would be allowed to sign up.

Now, in a random sample size in California -- which, if it was truly chosen randomly, statistically, that will probably represent the whole with a given margin of error -- as many as 15 percent of those aren't citizens.

If I am a taxpayer in Louisiana, I am thinking, "What the heck.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

We were told this would only be for citizens. Now my tax dollars are going to subsidize someone here illegally, potentially."

I guess I am wondering, does the administration -- your kind of view of this -- and I don't mean to overread -- seems a little nonplussed. "Yeah. Might be. But we will trust the Californians to pull it together." And I say that not to indict, but only to observe.

Again, am I wrong on this?

Ms. Daly. Well, I think we are concerned, and that is why we have done the work that we have done to provide you, the overseers for this program, among others, the information that you need to provide that oversight.

Dr. Cassidy. Well, I thank you for that.

Ms. Daly. I think you know the challenges that the marketplaces were facing.

Dr. Cassidy. I am almost out of time.

I recognize that. But, nonetheless, the challenges the marketplaces were facing did not excuse them from executing the law, which is only citizens shall sign up.

And it does seem as something that should require HHS to follow aggressively, if only to keep at least this measure of commitment to the American people, that only citizens would be allowed to do so.

I am out of time. Thank you all for your testimony.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Chair now recognize the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shimkus, 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you.

And thanks for coming.

I am sorry I was absent for a lot of it. That is why I waited in line to hear some of the exchange and the questions.

From the Inspector General's Office of Health and Human Services. Right? So you are doing an internal review of the signups, proper or improper, and you have proffered a report.

And I think that is where some of the frus -- I guess some of the frustration is, is some of these things come out in the report. What would compel the HHS or CMS to rapidly respond to fix these deficiencies? I guess that is the concern.

You are the OIG. All you can do is report. Right? You can't go to the new secretary or the former secretary and say, "Act. Here's a major problem."

But I guess, from the tone of some of my colleagues, they are not convinced that there was red flags flying that this was a problem and that there may have been a delay.

So let me go to the question. I mean, I am just trying to put my observation in the few minutes I have been here, trying to think through the line of questioning.

So when CMS failed to put a fully operational eligibility system

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

in place, it had -- we believe it had major consequences.

And I think your report highlights that, yeah, there are some major problems when you don't have a fully operational system.

We have learned that the verification process to resolve inconsistencies often did not start until May -- right? -- even though, in fact, it could be very likely that these inconsistencies contained in the applications submitted in October -- is it safe to say that they languished for months without resolution?

Ms. Greenleaf. May is outside the period that we report on. And during the period that we report where we say 2.6 million inconsistencies were unresolved is through October -- October through mid-February for the Federal exchange.

Mr. Shimkus. So we could say it languished through that period of time at least?

Ms. Greenleaf. For that period of time, yeah, they were unable to resolve inconsistencies, in particular regarding citizenship.

Mr. Shimkus. Can we -- do you think that we can -- you don't know for sure. But, again, going on some of the lines of the questions, is it safe to guess that some of these inconsistencies that you identified are still unresolved?

Ms. Greenleaf. We don't have information to that effect. We will be tracking CMS's response and ask CMS to report back to us in our recommendations regarding --

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Shimkus. I guess that is part of this whole debate and a little bit of frustration.

So when are -- so we got the answer that there is an interim pamphlet. Right? But, I guess, isn't this compelling enough to say give us more information now?

I mean, what kick-starts that additional review by you to see that there is not -- that the inconsistencies that you raised based upon the February time frame -- and maybe we assume May -- that they are still not inconsistencies and that they have been resolved?

Ms. Greenleaf. Well, we will be monitoring their response to our report and --

Mr. Shimkus. Wait. Wait. Wait. That is the frustration, "We will be monitoring."

Are you monitoring? I mean, that is the problem. I mean, don't you understand? "We will be." No. A lot of us think you should be. This monitoring should have been done, especially with these gross inconsistencies.

Ms. Daly.

Ms. Daly. Yes, sir. Thank you for the opportunity.

I think that, you know, we will do -- as my colleague here pointed out, we do follow up on our recommendations. And at the same time we already are beginning extra work out at the Federal marketplace.

And as part of that we can be assessing whether -- the status of

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

addressing those inconsistencies that we currently are aware of. I would be very interested in learning the new processes that are in place. Of course that work is going to really --

Mr. Shimkus. Okay. So we are -- please. I guess we would like you to try. Not wait. I mean, that is our frustration.

These inconsistencies are as large as they might be, and we have had a long time. Then -- we want this present tense, not future tense. Does that make sense? It should be going on now.

So because -- aren't we coming right now to another signup? Right? Enrollment is coming.

If we haven't fixed the original signup and the inconsistencies -- we have identified the problems. We don't have follow-up. We don't know if they have been fixed.

Aren't we at risk of having the same problem in the next enrollment? If they haven't addressed it, will we have the same problem, Ms. Greenleaf?

Ms. Greenleaf. If CMS doesn't address our recommendations, we would be concerned that additional inconsistencies would remain unresolved, and that could lead to inaccurate determinations.

Mr. Shimkus. Okay. You have been very helpful, at least for my part. Just remember -- I will leave on this, Mr. Chairman -- present tense, not future tense, and we would all be a lot happier.

Mr. Pitts. The chair thanks the gentleman.

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

That concludes the questions of the Members who are in attendance. There will be a lot of other questions from other members as well to follow up, and we will submit those to you in writing. We ask that you please respond promptly.

I remind Members that they have ten business days to submit questions for the record. Members should submit their questions by the close of business on Wednesday, July 30.

I have a UC request. I would like to insert into the record an article in the New York Times from October 16, 2013, where Secretary Sebelius is quoted as saying, "I think we are on target. We are on track to flip the switch on October 1 and say to people come on and sign up."

Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. And the Ranking Member has a UC request.

Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, I would asking unanimous consent to enter into the record a letter from June 4 from Ranking Member Waxman to Chairman Upton.

Mr. Pitts. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

**This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.**

Mr. Pitts. Very interesting hearing. Thank you. We look forward to working with you to get more information.

Without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:44 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]