Meeting Minutes
Digital Bridge Interim Governance Body

Meeting Information

Objective:	1.) Describe project phase 3 progress; (2) Discuss and approve the plan for phased eCR implementation; (3) Discuss and approve an initial plan for organizing governance work during phase 3; and (4) discuss objectives or success criteria for eCR implementation		
Date:	March 9, 2017	**Location:**	1-866-516-9291
Time:	12:00 – 1:30 PM EST	**Meeting Type:**	Virtual
Called By:	Project Management Office	**Facilitator:**	John Lumpkin
Timekeeper:	Charles Ishikawa	**Note Taker:**	Jelisa Lowe, Rob Brown
Attendees:	See attached		

Agenda Items

		Presenter	Time Allotted
1	Call to order and roll call	John Lumpkin / Charlie Ishikawa	5 min
2	Agenda review and approval	John Lumpkin	2 min
3	Digital Bridge Initiative Progress	Jim Jellison Jessica Cook	15 min
6	Digital Bridge eCR Implementation Plan	Jim Jellison Benson Chang	20 min
7	Objectives and Success Criteria for eCR Implementation	Jim Jellison	5 min
8	Governance Body Organizational Plan for Phase 3	Charlie Ishikawa	Remaining
9	Announcements and Adjournment	John Lumpkin	

Decisions

1	Draft eCR implementation plan is approved for use by implementation sites and technical teams who may recommend changes to Governance Body: Phase 1 (April 2017 – July 2017) – Michigan, Kansas, Utah; Phase 2 (July 2017 - ?) – California, Houston, Massachusetts, New York City. • Motion for approval made by Walter Suarez that was seconded by Bob Harmon. Verbal affirmative agreement taken. No oppositions or abstentions verbalized.
2	Governance Body Organizational Plan for Phase 3 is approved for use. • Motion for approval made by Bob Harmon that was seconded by Walter Suarez. Verbal affirmative agreement taken. No oppositions or abstentions verbalized

New Action Items

		Responsible	Due Date
A.	Refine eCR implementation timeline with input from sites and technical teams, and then present the revised timeline to Governance Body	PMO	April Governance Body Mtg
B.	Develop charges for Governance Body workgroups	PMO	April – May 2017
C.	Issue appointments for 90 minute, monthly Governance Body Meetings through January 2018	PMO	March 13th
D.	Set-up conversation with Epic, Cerner, APHL, and CSTE regarding RCKMS and eICR requirements	PMO	Open

Other Notes & Information

1. **Call to Order** – Quorum was met

2. **Agenda Review and Approval** – Dr. Lumpkin reviewed the agenda. There were no additions.

3. **Digital Bridge Initiative Progress**
   A. **Project Timeline –** The timeline will be discussed throughout in relation to the eCR implementations.
   B. **Communications –** A webinar will be held March 24 to communicate about eCR and the Digital Bridge to a wide public health audience. Several governance body members will be presenting, and with our initial marketing efforts, we have 176 registrants. In April, Health Datapalooza is coming up. A panel will be held Friday, April 28 and will include presentations of the eCR roadmap by CDC, a discussion of the eCR governance, and a demo of RCKMS eCR in action. Finally, we have new materials in Basecamp, including an updated fact sheet and talking points that include value propositions. We are also working on updated presentation slides that will include the new project timeline.
      i. Patina Zarcone will be presenting on Digital Bridge to the APHL board of directors on Friday, March 10.

4. **Digital Bridge eCR Implementation Plan –** Seven sites applied to be eCR implementation sites. The PMO decided to work with all seven but acknowledged that there could be capacity issues that would require a phased approach. Many of the governance body members met at HIMSS to compare notes about the sites (did not include site representatives) and came up with thoughts about phasing. The Deloitte team has contacted all seven sites in an initial outreach effort to gather additional information.

   Deloitte had a few readiness calls with site applicants to give them an opportunity to ask questions and let them know where we are now since they submitted their applications. Things discussed on the call included:
   - Abbreviated site readiness form
   - Review of the new phased approach
   - Timeline for implementation
   - Review of the implementation workgroup's plans for coordinating activities
   - Collaboration methods (i.e., Basecamp)
   - Sustainability Questionnaire
   - Next steps

   Sites were asked specifically if there are any schedule blockers, and that feedback was used as input to the phasing

approach. Findings from the call included:
- Vendor support for the payload of eICR is variable. Michigan has plans to implement that fully and others are planning to use another CDA document in place of an eICR until it's built into their processes .
- There is limited commitment to implement reportability response requirements.
- Sites wanted clarification of plans from test to production case report exchange
- Some sites had calendar considerations requested to take into account

Based on this, the PMO proposes:
- Phase 1 (April-May 2017) Michigan and California
- Phase 2 (June-July 2017) Kansas and Utah
- Phase 3 (August-September 2017) Houston, Massachusetts, New York City

Discussion and approval:
- There is concern that only one site will be using RCKMS and questions about whether any of the others are going to get to a place where they could use an eICR within a reasonable period of time?
    - Cerner plans on having it done in June-July timeframe. May use CDA document just to leverage to get it connected.
- The body agreed that this is an important issue (regarding the eICR) that needs to be addressed, and that they should identify acceptable alternatives if defined objectives can't be met.
- There was a proposal to group Michigan, Kansas and Utah together for phase 1, and the four remaining sites would make up phase 2—therefore, there would be two phases instead of three.
- The implementation timeline will be modified to show two phases (Michigan, Kansas and Utah between April and July for phase 1; and the remaining four—California, Houston, Massachusetts and New York City—between July and the end date). A more solid timeline will be presented at the next governance body meeting.
- For phase 2, there are two issues: more information about California and a conversation about capacity are needed.
    - Motioned by Walter Suarez and seconded by Bob Harmon.

5. **Objectives and Success Criteria for eCR Implementation** –The PMO created a list of objectives for eCR implementations and reviewed that list with the governance body. The PMO proposes if one site can demonstrate eCR, then we can claim success. eCR is defined by the list of criteria developed by the PMO.

    Discussion:
    - The body should think about minimum expectations for each of the sites. What's learned from the sites might suggest a concept to consider.
        - There should be a baseline of what the minimum should be, so that we know at least every pilot will try to meet the minimum bar and we would be looking for one site to meet all 11.
        - Because sites are constrained to five conditions, it is necessary to be able to demonstrate that they can handle trigger codes for those five conditions. One suggestion might is that the tenth and eleventh objectives (refer to slides) come later.
        - At a minimum, the majority need to do objectives 1-8.
        - This issue may be referred to one of the workgroups to resolve.

6. **Governance Body Organizational Plan for Phase 3 –** Charlie Ishikawa reviewed a proposed organizational plan for the governance body for phase 3. The proposed plan is organized into four overarching sets of activities and issues:
    A. Improving the governance process
    B. Implementing the Digital Bridge eCR model
    C. Characterizing the feasibility of alternative eCR technical and legal approaches
    D. Envisioning the future of the Digital Bridge initiative

Within each category, there are questions to be answered by January and that need to be delegated to smaller groups who can report their recommendations back to the governance body. The small workgroups proposed are:

- Implementation task force: oversee eCR implementation
- Evaluation committee: answers, "to what satisfaction did the technical approach work and what resources will it take to make it possible nationwide?"
- Techno-legal tiger team: advise the governance body on legal matters and possibilities for forming agreements
- Strategy workgroup: identify strategic goals and objectives and recommend strategies for the future of the Digital Bridge

Discussion and decisions:
- Two of them are related but are being handled in different groups. There are resource and technical arrangements that impact feasibility. There are a lot of technical issues that aren't related to legal work.
- The funding approach—a lot of the pilot states have interesting ways in how their funding their activities and that would be good to document when we want to expand our work.
- The fundamental upfront question is what is the differentiating value of Digital Bridge and where can that be leveraged? What's different about this compared to what's out there?
- Digital Bridge is about facilitating collaboration between health care, public health and health IT—there are existing forums that we can partner with or join that might be a good environment to advance this collaboration. Maybe it's an issue of differentiation or maybe it's an issue of looking at commonalities of other efforts.
- Bob Harmon motioned and Walter seconded (to proceed with this plan and workgroup charges).

7. **Announcements and Adjournment**
    A. Will have future meeting dates coming soon. Once a month for 90 minutes.
    B. Set up conversation with Epic/Cerner/APHL/CSTE [PMO]
    C. Modify timeline to show two phases [PMO]
    D. Finalize all workgroup charters [PMO]