

Meeting Minutes

Digital Bridge Interim Governance Body

Meeting Information

Objective:	(1) Describe and discuss progress and issues in implementing eCR from technical and legal perspectives, (2) discuss and approve a Digital Bridge roadmap, (3) request comments on a draft Digital Bridge responsibilities scope document; and (4) describe recent and upcoming communications activities.		
Date:	August 3, 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
Attendees:	See attached		

Agenda Items		Presenter	Time Allotted
1	Call to Order and Roll Call	John Lumpkin / Charlie Ishikawa	3 min
2	Agenda Review and Approval	John Lumpkin	2 min
3	eCR Implementation (<i>Wave 1 progress, variations on Digital Bridge eCR approach, legal and regulatory presentation</i>)	Rob Brown / Benson Chang / Jim Jellison	55 min
4	Digital Bridge Strategy (<i>Digital Bridge roadmap and responsibility scope</i>)	Alana Cheeks-Lomax	20 min
5	Updates and Announcements (<i>Communications and decision review/action</i>)	Jessica Cook / Charlie Ishikawa	10 min
6	Adjournment	John Lumpkin	Remaining

Decisions

- The Digital Bridge governance body approved a final draft of the Digital Bridge roadmap.
 - Motion by Bob Harmon that was seconded by Bill Mackenzie. Verbal vote taken. No opposition or abstentions. Motion passes with unanimous agreement.

New Action Items

	Responsible	Due Date
A. Produce Communications Plan Version 2	Digital Bridge Communications	August 2017

B.	Produce first draft of Digital Bridge bylaws	PMO	August 2017
C.	Produce issue brief about variance in eCR approach and MiHIN	PMO	August 14, 2017
D.	Provide feedback on Digital Bridge Responsibilities / in-out activities	Governance Body	August 2017

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. **eCR Implementation—**

- A. **Wave 1 Progress:** The Wave 1 implementation date is uncertain due to key issues the team is currently working to resolve. An estimated timeline is available that gives an idea based on current dependencies and unknowns. Utah and Kansas completed the initial AIMS connectivity, and Michigan is reviewing legal agreements for VPN connectivity. The AIMS team presented how to use the online validator to the implementation taskforce and the PMO, and it is now ready for wider testing. AllScripts has been using it for the past month and is providing feedback to the AIMS team.

The RCKMS integration is ongoing. Configuration and deployment has been completed, and testing began with the RCKMS team on July 5. Regarding trigger code analysis, the implementation taskforce reached out to all sites to request what trigger codes public health and vendors are using in order to compare it against the reportable conditions trigger code table (RCTC) that was published previously. It will be used to update another version of the RCTC table.

Cerner’s implementation for the eICR 1.1 support is delayed due to competing priorities. To mitigate this issue, they are engaging with Intermountain to discuss resources for development while leveraging the Intermountain Research Informatics department. Another issue is that the increase in the complexity of test scenarios will cause a delay in creating test eICRs. Test scenarios have been sent to Lantana.

There was a suggestion for the implementation Taskforce to monitor and document the rate of change in the national trigger codes being built into the EHR and RCKMS tool. The Taskforce will take this into consideration, and will likely include this as part of their scope.

- B. **Variations on Digital Bridge eCR Approach:** The Digital Bridge PMO informed the governance body about an implementation issue regarding the Michigan site that has since been resolved. Michigan had two implementation projects that incorporated a health information exchange (HIE). However, one of those approaches had variations from what’s understood to be the requirements of the technical architecture that was developed and approved by the Digital Bridge during phase 2. There is concern among some partners over the timeliness and completeness of case reports provided with this variant architecture, and concern over the general scalability of the approach. The PMO is drafting an issue brief for the Governance Body, and help the initiative to learn from the experience and better handle similar situations in the future.

Three questions, or comments were made in discussion. First, it was clarified that there are still seven implementation sites. Second, Bill Mac Kenzie (CDC) suggested that it was his belief that all alternative models should be reviewed by the Technical Architecture Workgroup—or similarly formed equivalent.

Third, Kathy Turner (CSTE) suggested that it might be helpful to know, as part of the issue brief, how many jurisdictions other than MI may have utilized an approach similar to the alternative that MI had proposed.

- C. **Legal and Regulatory:** The legal and regulatory workgroup met with Davis Wright and Tremaine (DWT) to review their initial findings. DWT provided a concise set of options and recommendations for further consideration.

Option 1: De-identified case reports to be reported to the decision support intermediary (DSI); then as identified after it is processed by the DSI's case reporting logic. This option is not technically feasible in the short- or medium-term, but could be in the long-term.

Option 2: The second option is for the DSI to work as an agent of the public health agencies. Providers and EHRs would consume both national and local calls from a single national source (DSI) and execute case reporting logic. The DSI would only receive case reports that are likely reportable under local law. This option is not feasible for the implementation sites and doesn't match the Digital Bridge technical architecture. However, it could be feasible in the medium- or long-term if interoperability standards make it easier for public health to update their jurisdictional reporting criteria.

Option 3: The third option is for the DSI to act as a business associate by entering into an agreement with providers, EHRs and HIEs. Providers and EHRs would consume national trigger codes and execute case reporting logic based on national codes. The DSI receives case reports based on national triggers, executes RCKMS local trigger code logic, and reports cases reportable in the local jurisdiction. The workgroup decided to move forward with this option for the implementation sites, and DWT is drafting contractual language for sites to pursue. DWT has concerns about privacy issues and would encourage us to consider options 1 and 2 over the longer term. Next steps are to learn more about the content of draft agreements that will be used for the implementations and to discuss further long-term strategies from a legal and regulatory perspective.

A point and one question were raised during discussion. First, the importance of gathering input from technical experts regarding each of the options was noted. Such a group would need to be formed and charged by the Governance Body. Secondly, whether a single or multiple agreements would be necessary for large provider systems (e.g., Intermountain Health) was asked. PHII will refer the question to DWT.

4. Digital Bridge Strategy –

- A. **Roadmap for the Digital Bridge:** The team presented two documents: the Digital Bridge roadmap and the draft responsibilities document that highlights what is in and out of scope for the project. At the last Greenhouse, discussions began around these two topics, so the strategy team has been refining those findings. Also at the last Greenhouse meeting, there was a discussion about developing use case criteria and deciding the next use case. The roadmap indicates what the plans and milestones are for the initiative within the next 10-15 years. Approval from the governance body is needed to develop new Digital Bridge bylaws and governance structure.
- B. **Digital Bridge Responsibility Scope:** The workgroup continued conversations started at the Greenhouse about what activities fall under the responsibility of Digital Bridge and what activities do not. The output of those conversations help support the group's recommendations for a funding model and future infrastructure. Alana presented questions for the governance body to consider and asked for feedback on the list of things the workgroup put together for what was in and out of scope. The only suggestion was to change "trust and legal" to legal framework (under what's in scope) and "legal" to legal contracts (under what's out of scope). The strategy workgroup will go on a six-week hiatus until mid-September so that the PMO can continue work on the Digital Bridge and eCR sustainability plans. The goal is to present both

plans in October.

5. **Updates and Announcements—**

- A. **Digital Bridge Communications:** Digital Bridge had a successful presentation at NACCHO, packed with attendees who asked engaging questions. That drove a number of people to the Digital Bridge booth to continue the conversation and be added to the growing Digital Bridge e-mail list. In late July, Walter Suarez presented on the legal trust framework at the ONC 21st Century Cures Act Trusted Exchange Framework kick-off meeting. On August 4, Oscar Alleyne and Janet Hui will give an educational presentation on the Digital Bridge for the HIMSS staff. Also, there will be a Digital Bridge panel at the upcoming APHA Conference in November. New communications materials on eCR but relative to Digital Bridge have been created and will be integrated into a new communications plan. There are also plans for a webinar series that will kick off in October. Each webinar will focus on specific workgroup topics. The first one will highlight legal and regulatory activities. The communications advisory group will meet in August to begin supporting the communications team with strategic questions around communications goals.

- B. **Review Decisions and Major Actions:** Charlie reviewed the approval of the roadmap, and went over next steps due before the next meeting. The next governance meeting will be September 7.

6. **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 2:20 PM EDT