Round 1 (Oct 2013 - Mar 2014)	Round 2 (Apr - Sept 2014)	Type of Change	Reason for Change	Burden Change
Medicaid and CHIP Eligibility Review Pilot Sampling Plan Template	Round 2 Medicaid and CHIP Eligibility Review Pilot Proposal Template	Rev	More accurate title and identifies the specific round.	No
Section headings identified with a description only	Section headings identified with a description and letter and each item under the heading identified with a number.	Rev	Easier to identify each section	No
Administrative title removed and information incorporated into General Information Section	A. GENERAL INFORMATION - Additional information requested: (2) Pilot version & (10) Explain hoe the above entities are independent		Lessons learned from the first round, it was difficult to track revisions made to the original proposal so by adding the Pilot version tracking is easier. Guidance requires that the agency performing the reviews and the agency making the eligibility determinations are separate, during the first round we were constantly asking states to provide this information.	explanation of 2 to 3

Not in Round 1	B. BACKGROUND INFORMATION - Additional question (2) on the date state implemented MAGI redetermination, these were not a part of round 1.	Rev	Lessons learned from the first round, these questions were moved from under sampling because it was determined this was a more logical grouping for them	Yes, requires state to include a date
SAMPLING	C. SAMPLING UNIT		Lessons learned from the first round, these questions were grouped together in a more logical sections. In the first round states were not including this information in the proposals because they were unclear on the information being requested. This caused used to request clarification from the states and revisions of their pilot proposals.	No
SAMPLING	D. SAMPLING FRAME CONSTRUCTION		Lessons learned from the first round, these questions were grouped together in a more logical sections. In the first round states were not including this information in the proposals because they were unclear on the information being requested. This caused used to request clarification from the states and revisions of their pilot proposals.	No
SAMPLING	E. SAMPLING FRAME TIME FRAME		Lessons learned from the first round, these questions were grouped together in a more logical sections. In the first round states were not including this information in the proposals because they were unclear on the information being requested. This caused used to request clarification from the states and revisions of their pilot proposals.	No

SAMPLING	F. SAMPLING FRAME EXCLUSIONS	Lessons learned from the first round, these questions were grouped together in a more logical sections. In the first round states were not including this information in the proposals because they were unclear on the information being requested. This caused used to request clarification from the states and revisions of their pilot proposals.	No
SAMPLING	G. SAMPLING FRAME QUALITY CONTROL	Lessons learned from the first round, these questions were grouped together in a more logical sections. In the first round states were not including this information in the proposals because they were unclear on the information being requested. This caused used to request clarification from the states and revisions of their pilot proposals.	No
SAMPLING	H. SAMPLING	Lessons learned from the first round, these questions were grouped together in a more logical sections. In the first round states were not including this information in the proposals because they were unclear on the information being requested. This caused used to request clarification from the states and revisions of their pilot proposals.	No
CASE REVIEW	I. CASE REVIEW	Lessons learned from the first round, questions asked under the Results section in Round 1 were incorporated because it was logical for them to be in this section because states review process should be able to respond to these questions	No

PAYMENT	J. PAYMENT REVIEW	Rev	Letter added for easier identification of section	No
RESULTS	Removed	Rev	Incorporated in case review - more logical grouping	No
RESOLIS	TKETHOVEG	l CCV	morporated in case review more logical grouping	
TEST CASE RESULTS	Removed	Rev	This information no longer being captured on this	No
TEST CASE NESSETS	removed	IXCV	template	
			·	
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	K. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	Rev	Letter added for easier identification of section	No
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	IK. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	Rev	Letter added for easier identification of Section	INU