Digital Bridge Governance Principles

• **Transparency:** Stakeholders will have visibility into the governance body’s work and opportunities to provide input.

• **Respect for Process:** Governance body members will adhere to an agreed upon decision-making process. Members will observe delineated and agreed upon roles and responsibilities.

• **Outreach:** The governance body can solicit opinions and presentations from stakeholders to inform its decision-making.

• **Utility:** The governance body will prioritize use of existing information technology standards and infrastructure as it pursues shared and realistic goals that benefit all parties.

• **Representativeness:** Governance body members will represent their broader field and be responsive to the goals of the Digital Bridge partnership.

• **Trust:** Governance body members will honor commitments made to the Digital Bridge effort.
Governance Body Meeting

Thursday, September 7th, 2017
12:00 – 1:30 PM EDT

This meeting will be recorded for note taking purposes only
Meeting Agenda

**Purpose**

1. Describe overall initiative plans, progress and timeline
2. Identify and discuss eCR implementation progress from technical and legal perspectives
3. Discuss possible ways to address alternative eCR approaches
4. Provide insights to improve the development of strategic plans for the Digital Bridge
5. Discuss and identify ways that the governance body has and may continue to support communication goals.

**Material**

1. Issue Brief: Alternative eCR Approaches
2. Proposed Digital Bridge Organizational Structure
3. Digital Bridge Funding Model Analysis
4. Digital Bridge Communications Plan ver. 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>Call to Order – John Lumpkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:03 PM</td>
<td>Agenda Review and Approval – John Lumpkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 PM</td>
<td>Digital Bridge eCR Implementations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:50 PM</td>
<td>Digital Bridge Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM</td>
<td>Digital Bridge Communications – Jessica Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:28 PM</td>
<td>Review decision and major actions – Charlie Ishikawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Adjournment – John Lumpkin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Progress: Wave 1 and 2 implementations - Rob Brown and Benson Chang
2. Update: Legal and Regulatory - Walter Suarez
4. Presentation: Digital Bridge funding model analysis - Ben Stratton and Benson Chang
5. Comments and Discussion: Feedback on business model skeleton and funding analysis - John Lumpkin
Overall Status Report

Initiative Roadmap and eCR Timeline

Jim Jellison
Digital Bridge Strategic Roadmap
Milestones & Critical Activities

PHASE III (2017)
- Jun: Governance by-laws approved
- Aug: Operating model approved by Governance Body
- Nov: Drafted by-laws approved
- Dec: Operating model self-sustaining

PHASE IV (2018-2019)
- Jan: Concept of Operations developed
- Aug: Template for eCR legal agreements developed
- Sep: Reportability Response (RR) Published
- Dec: Use case 2 launched

PHASE V (2020-2021)
- Jan: Use case 3 launched
- Nov: Infrastructure for new use cases
- Jan: Legal agreement templates developed for subsequent use cases

PHASE VI (2022-2023)
- Jan: Use case 4 launched
- Jan: Operating model self-sustaining
- Jan: Funding Model 100% in effect

Legend:
- Operations
- Funding
- Technical Infrastructure
- Legal
- Users & Use Cases
- Communications
- Critical Path
- Other Milestones
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*** General Notes: (1) Complexity is used as a rough proxy for the needed resources and effort to complete a milestone,
(2) Overall timeline and milestones are subject to change depending on project dependencies.
eCR Project Timeline

2017 Q1
- Governance: Coordinate Workgroups (WGs) and Engage Stakeholders
  - Requirements WG: Ongoing Curation of Functional Requirements
  - Technical Arch WG: Ongoing Curation of Functional Requirements

2017 Q2
- Sustainability WG: Strategy Working Group
  - Digital Bridge Roadmap
- Legal WG: Legal and Regulatory Workgroup
  - Template Agreements
- Technical Arch WG: Implementation Task Force
  - Wave 1 AIMS Onboarding

2017 Q3
- Governance: Coordinate Workgroups (WGs) and Engage Stakeholders
  - Requirements WG: Ongoing Curation of Functional Requirements
  - Technical Arch WG: Ongoing Curation of Functional Requirements
- Legal WG: Legal and Regulatory Workgroup
  - Sites Execute Agreements
- Evaluation Committee
  - Evaluation Plan

2017 Q4
- Governance: Coordinate Workgroups (WGs) and Engage Stakeholders
  - Requirements WG: Ongoing Curation of Functional Requirements
  - Legal WG: Functional Requirements Refined
- Technical Arch WG: Implementation Task Force
  - Wave 1 eCR Exchange
- Legal WG: Legal and Regulatory Workgroup
  - eCR Legal Framework
  - Submit Digital Bridge and eCR Sustainability Plans to Gov. Body
- Evaluation Committee
  - Evaluation Plan

2018 Q1
- Governance: Coordinate Workgroups (WGs) and Engage Stakeholders
  - Requirements WG: Ongoing Curation of Functional Requirements
  - Legal WG: Functional Requirements Refined
- Technical Arch WG: Implementation Task Force
  - Wave 1 eCR Exchange
  - Document Lessons Learned
- Legal WG: Legal and Regulatory Workgroup
  - eCR Legal Framework
- Evaluation Committee
  - Preliminary Wave 1 Evaluation
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Digital Bridge eCR Implementation

1. Progress | Wave 1 and 2 implementations - Rob Brown and Benson Chang
2. Update | Legal and Regulatory – Walter Suarez (Workgroup Chair)
Digital Bridge eCR Implementation

1. Progress | Wave 1 and 2 implementations - Rob Brown and Benson Chang
2. Update | Legal and Regulatory – Walter Suarez (Workgroup Chair)
# Risk Impact Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Epic implementation for eICR 1.1 support (minus travel history) is delayed due to competing priorities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Cerner and Intermountain are working on an approach for eICR 1.1. The Implementation Taskforce and Digital Bridge PMO are assessing and monitoring the approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Third party security assessment will not occur before initial implementations are in production</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>On eCR roadmap for March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Issue Impact Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cerner implementation for eICR 1.1 support is delayed due to competing priorities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Cerner and Intermountain are working on an approach for eICR 1.1. The Implementation Taskforce and Digital Bridge PMO are assessing and monitoring the approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An increase in the complexity and thoroughness of the test scenarios will cause a delay in the creation of the test eICRs</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The set of 9 test scenarios are being finalized. Test scenario narratives may be provided to sites earlier than the full test scenario package. Complete test data is expected by the end of September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Risk Impact Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Epic implementation for eICR 1.1 support (minus travel history) is delayed</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Epic's software updates for eICR are released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Third party security assessment will not occur before initial implementations are in production</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>On eCR roadmap for March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legal agreements and data use agreements beyond initial implementation (risk for both Implementation and Strategy WG)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The Legal Workgroup is working on the creation of legal and data use agreements for the short term of the implementations and longer term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reportability Response (RR) standards changing between balloting and November publication</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Technical team will be involved in HL7 RR ballot reconciliation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Technical Partners CSTE &amp; APHL may have funding and sustainability shortfalls for FY18</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Identify gaps in resources/ funding and work to address them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site Status in Preparation for Onboarding and Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Sites</th>
<th>Provider/Vendor, HIE Activities</th>
<th>Public Health Activities</th>
<th>Site Connectivity with AIMS</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Cerner &amp; Intermountain development work for Utah can be leveraged for Kansas. For Public Health (PH), the activity remaining is the ability to receive Reportability Response (RR). Completed PH connectivity with AIMS; will begin testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For PH, the activities remaining are the ability to receive eICR 1.1 and ability to receive RR. Technical kick off occurred with Michigan site; AIMS to complete VPN connectivity documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerner &amp; Intermountain are working on an approach for eICR. PH is ready; their activities are complete. Completed PH connectivity with AIMS; will begin testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epic’s software updates are released. Working through Provider concerns. PH is making progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Houston</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epic’s software updates are released. Provider and PH are making progress. AIMS is working with Provider and PH on Direct transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epic’s software updates are released. Provider and PH are making progress. For PH, the activities remaining are test and production environment setup and the ability to receive RR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epic’s software updates are released. Working through Provider concerns. PH is making progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Revised Implementation Timeline - Wave 1 - Kansas, Michigan, Utah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCKMS &amp; AIMS Development and Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCKMS Criteria Testing (Internal, Jurisdictional Criteria)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Test Scenarios &amp; Test Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Testing (Iterative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Testing (AIMS &amp; RCKMS Together)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Testing (AIMS &amp; RCKMS Separate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement With Implementation Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCKMS Training Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS Transport Onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Post Production Technical Support Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Digital Bridge eCR Implementation

1. Progress | Wave 1 and 2 implementations - Rob Brown and Benson Chang
2. Update | Legal and Regulatory – Walter Suarez (Workgroup Chair)
Previous Work

• DWT has drafted an analysis of privacy laws and related recommendations for eCR
• Legal and regulatory workgroup has provided feedback
• DWT has refined its eCR recommendations and discussed them with clients (RWJF, APHL, TFGH/PHII)
  • See next slide
• DWT discussed eCR recommendations with implementation stakeholders (Aug. 2)
• PMO shared eCR recommendations with Digital Bridge governance body (Aug. 3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Short Term (Initial Sites)</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 (De-Identification): De-identified case reports initially reported to decision support intermediary (DSI); then as identified after processing by DSI’s case reporting logic</td>
<td>No - Not technically feasible in short term</td>
<td>No - Not technically feasible in medium term</td>
<td>? - May be worth investment due to privacy law compliance and potential uses for de-identified data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 (Public Health Agent): DSI is an agent of public health agencies; providers/EHRs would consume both national and local calls from single national source (DSI) and execute case reporting logic; DSI only receives case reports that are likely reportable under local law.</td>
<td>? - Not feasible for most of the initial implementation sites, but it may be possible for one to test feasibility</td>
<td>Yes; if EHRs/HIEs able and willing to implement case reporting logic. Benefits: Low HIPAA risk; manageable number of agreements</td>
<td>Yes; see medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 (DSI as BA): DSI enters into BAAs with providers, EHRs, HIEs. Providers/EHRs would consume national trigger codes and execute case reporting logic based on national codes. DSI receives case reports based on national triggers, executes RCKMS local-trigger-codes logic, and report cases reportable in the local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Yes – Initial sites familiar with BAAs</td>
<td>? – Increased legal risk to DSI due to HIPAA and amount of case reports received; scalability issues due to number of agreements.</td>
<td>? – see medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current and Next Steps

**Short Term (August – November 2017)**
- DWT is drafting agreements for implementation sites’ review
  - Based on Option 3 – Decision support intermediary acts as business associate of provider
  - DWT will be following up with legal/contractual points of contact at implementation sites
  - DWT will prioritize discussions with implementation sites based on site technical readiness
- Next Workgroup meeting: Sep 13, 10AM
- Anticipated Milestones:
  - Now: implementation sites work on implementation, testing with synthetic patient data
  - Late Sept. 2017: draft agreements ready for review
  - Nov. 2017: executed agreements (at least one site, allowing for production eCR)
  - Executed agreements + successful testing = transition to production eCR

**Longer Term (Sept. 2017 – Feb. 2018)**
- Technical/Legal collaboration to consider options 1, 2
- Additional info will be provided via implementation taskforce and www.digitalbridge.us
Digital Bridge eCR Implementation

1. Progress | Wave 1 and 2 implementations - Rob Brown and Benson Chang
2. Update | Legal and Regulatory – Walter Suarez (Workgroup Chair)
Issue Brief

Alternative eCR Approaches

A site planning to implement an eCR approach that is an alternative of the DB-eCR was selected for Digital Bridge Phase 3. As planning and preparation work commenced, an issue developed over whether or not to support the alternative approach.

The issue concerns three questions:

1. Can the alternative approach meet mission-critical requirements for reportable conditions surveillance?
2. Is the alternative approach a consistent, standards-based and nationally scalable solution?
3. When opinions on such questions differ, how does the Digital Bridge collaborative make a decision?

The issue was settled on July 26, 2017 when the site in question reluctantly withdrew plans to implement the alternative eCR approach, and chose to focus on another implementation that aligns with DB-eCR. The issue’s questions, however, were left unanswered.
Digital Bridge Strategy

Ben Stratton and Benson Chang
Strategy Workgroup Updates

• Hosted ad-hoc strategy workgroup meeting (8/28)
• Updated Digital Bridge ROI Model based on feedback from providers, vendors, and public health stakeholders
• Workgroup Deliverables
  • Continued developing use case criteria and began discussing Digital Bridge’s next use case
  • Started drafting Digital Bridge sustainability plan and eCR transition plan
• Governance Body Asks
  • Receive feedback on:
    1. Digital Bridge financial analysis
    2. Outline of Digital Bridge sustainability plan
Digital Bridge Strategy Document Overview

Financial Planning Dashboard

• Contents:
  • Dashboard of financial scenarios. User editable to identify how Digital Bridge can grow in the future.
    • Provides needed revenue to support a given scenario
    • Provides a view of the various revenue streams Digital Bridge can collect

• Result:
  • Understand the potential financial models for Digital Bridge and the potential for understanding it themselves by using the Dashboard tool
  • Have a sense of the scale of the costs and revenue needed to support Digital Bridge moving forward
  • Identify the key questions to drive development of the long-term Digital Bridge strategy

Sustainability Plan Skeleton

• Contents:
  • Detailed outline of Digital Bridge and eCR sustainability plans

• Result:
  • Understand and provide comments on the outline of the upcoming Digital Bridge sustainability plan
**Funding Model Dashboard**

To be updated to include an “Administrative Function”

### General Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blended Rate ($/hr)</th>
<th>Annual Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use Case Funding Model Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use Case Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual FTEs</th>
<th>Annual Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>$2945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>$3720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>$366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>$376,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FTE Seeding Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstream</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline FTEs</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and Legal</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent and Handoff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Coordination</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1.5A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart: Annual Number of FTEs

### Chart: Annual Cost per Activity

---
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To be updated to include an “Administrative Function”
**Digital Bridge Activity Cost Details: 1-8 Use Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>FTE Range</th>
<th>FTE Cost Range**</th>
<th>Other Cost Categories</th>
<th>Other Cost Value per year</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>$208,000 - $832,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Grants; Membership</td>
<td>Leverage tools/cost categories from program management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management*</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>6 - 31.5</td>
<td>$1,248,000 - $6,552,000</td>
<td>Teleconferencing (2-3 lines, web enabled); Collaboration Site (i.e. Basecamp); SDLC tools; Digital Bridge Conferences</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>Grants (2017-2018/2019), Membership, Fee For Service, Other Fees, Contracts</td>
<td>This estimate is based on scaling from where the PMO is now. As more use cases are added and the work becomes more complex we anticipate more work being needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust &amp; Legal</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>$208,000 - $624,000</td>
<td>Payments to Law Firm</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>$208,000 - $1,040,000</td>
<td>Marketing materials; external conferences; Website Hosting (i.e. <a href="http://www.digitalbridge.us">www.digitalbridge.us</a>)</td>
<td>$65,400</td>
<td>Grants (2017-2018), Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>$208,000 - $1,040,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per Year</strong></td>
<td>10 - 48.5</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,080,000 - $10,088,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$207,600</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* -- Incubator & Handoff, Operations Coordination, and Funding are all activities that the PMO will be directly and solely responsible for. Thus, the FTEs and Other Cost Categories add up to the total for Program Management.

** -- FTE Cost calculated using 2080 hours per year per FTE and a blended rate of $100/hr. which includes salary and benefits.
## Program Management Cost Details: 1-8 Use Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>FTE Range</th>
<th>FTE Cost Range</th>
<th>Other Cost Categories</th>
<th>Other Cost Value per year</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incubator &amp; Handoff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>3 – 10</td>
<td>$624,000 - $2,080,000</td>
<td>(subset of PM)</td>
<td>Shared with PM</td>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>Leverage tools/cost categories from program management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Coordination</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>2 – 19.5</td>
<td>$416,000 - $4,056,000</td>
<td>(subset of PM)</td>
<td>Shared with PM</td>
<td>Fee For Service, Other Fees</td>
<td>Leverage tools/cost categories from program management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>$208,000 - $416,000</td>
<td>(subset of PM)</td>
<td>Shared with PM</td>
<td>Grants (2017-2019)</td>
<td>Leverage tools/cost categories from program management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 – 31.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,248,000 - $6,552,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* -- Incubator & Handoff, Operations Coordination, and Funding are all activities that the PMO will be directly and solely responsible for. Thus, the FTEs and Other Cost Categories add up to the total for Program Management.

** -- FTE Cost calculated using 2080 hours per year per FTE and a blended rate of $100/hr, which includes salary and benefits.
### Other Cost Category Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Cost Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Cost per Year</th>
<th>Roll Up Category</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teleconferencing (2-3 lines, web-enabled)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration site (i.e. Basecamp)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Development Lifecycle Tools</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing materials</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Conference Attendance</td>
<td>6x per year</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$50,400</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Using HIMSS as rough base: three attendees, $800/person registration, $300 flight, four nights of hotel at $400/night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Hosting</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Bridge Conferences</td>
<td>2x per year</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>Estimate based on Greenhouse budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Organization Membership</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>Standards Management</td>
<td>Using HL7 as a benchmark, contractor with a revenue of $1-5M, receives three votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to law firm</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Trust &amp; Legal</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Digital Bridge Sustainability Plan

Benson Chang & Ben Stratton
Digital Bridge Sustainability Plan Outline - DRAFT

• Executive Summary
  • Background
  • Mission, Objectives, and Benefits
• PART I: Digital Bridge
  • Digital Bridge Organizational Structure
    • Proposed Organizational Structure
    • Digital Bridge Responsibilities
    • Governance Body
    • Resources and Staffing
  • Digital Bridge Business Model
    • Business Development Incubator
    • Membership Model
    • Fee for Service
  • Digital Bridge Sustainment and Scaling
    • Use Cases
    • Technology & Infrastructure
    • Digital Bridge Roadmap
• Budget and Financial
  • Operating Costs
  • Potential Funding Sources
  • Other Funding Sources

• PART II: Electronic Case Reporting (eCR)
  • eCR Sustainment and Scaling
  • Technology and Infrastructure
  • eCR Roadmap
• Appendix
  • Appendix A – Digital Bridge Roadmap
  • Appendix B – eCR Roadmap
  • Appendix C – ROI Model
  • Appendix D – Use Case Criteria Rubric
Digital Bridge Activities

• Workgroup continued the conversation from Digital Bridge Greenhouse Meeting
  • Which activities are the responsibility of Digital Bridge vs. those that are not the responsibility of Digital Bridge?
  • Conversation supports workgroup and tiger team recommendations for funding and business model approach

• Questions for consideration
  1. Are there any activities that are currently not included on either lists?
  2. Are there any activities that are currently in the incorrect category?
  3. Are there any activities that are currently listed as the responsibility of Digital Bridge but may not be in the future? And vice versa?
Workgroup Next Steps

Benson Chang & Ben Stratton
Strategy Workgroup Next Steps

• Continue to compile feedback on use case criteria and use case framework
• Update Digital Bridge financial analysis based on feedback
• Finalize ROI model and create ROI model one-pager
• Continue working on the draft Digital Bridge sustainability plan & eCR transition plan
Digital Bridge Communications

Jessica Cook
2016-17 Communications Highlights

• Developed a communications plan and supporting materials (visual identity, messaging, etc.)
• Early interest; stories ran in trade publications
• Over 25 outside presentations in the last year
• Website traffic grew
• Public health support
• Suite of attractive graphics and messaging recently developed for eCR
## Estimated reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Estimated reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>• Approximately <strong>650 visits</strong> per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>• <strong>3,354</strong> subscribers/mentioned in <strong>12+ newsletters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>• <strong>Over 25 presentations</strong>, including webinars and subcommittee calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presented at <strong>five major conferences</strong> this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approximately 50-75 attendees at conference sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Booth traffic; e-newsletter sign-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>• Mentioned in <strong>six articles</strong> primarily geared toward health care and health IT professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>• Social media posts reach about <strong>400 people per post</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Website traffic patterns

Source: Google analytics (installed on site in Feb)
Challenges

• Large and fragmented external audiences.

• High expectations for communications, but resources—budget and staff—are limited.

• Communicating the success of Digital Bridge depends on implementation sites.

• Increased interest, but most is from public health.

• Possible misunderstanding that Digital Bridge is an eCR initiative only. Challenge of educating audiences about eCR and separating Digital Bridge from it.
Updated Communications Plan (2.0)

• Goals
• Audience descriptions (same)
• Communication approaches
• Messages for different goals and audiences
• Channels and tools for communicating (expanded)
• Report on communications activity from last year
• **Timeframe of plan is 9-12 months.** Anticipate the plan will need to be adjusted this spring.
Communication Goals

- **Persuade (potential funders) that Digital Bridge is a viable public-private partnership for effective information sharing between health care and public health.**
  - Communicate what Digital Bridge is and its long-term vision.
  - Address the problems that the Digital Bridge solves.
  - Communicate the success of the first project. Emphasize more will come.

- **Increase understanding and uptake of the Digital Bridge approach to electronic case reporting (eCR).**
  - Keep audiences informed of the implementation sites’ progress and timeline.
  - Address concerns around legal issues and sustainability.
  - Reinforce the value of this approach to specific audiences.
Communications Approaches
1. Development Strategy

For increasing support of Digital Bridge

• We have a clear vision for Digital Bridge—and we can engage potential funders in our purpose.

• We understand and can communicate what problems Digital Bridge solves.

• We have a core story for Digital Bridge that inspires others to get involved.

• We leverage our existing relationships to open new doors.
2. Diffusion of Innovations Theory

For increasing uptake of the eCR approach

Innovators and Early Adopters

• Conference and webinar presentations
• Building a network of champions for eCR

Majority

• Conference and webinar presentations
• E-newsletters, social media, SEO to expand reach
• New tactics: webinar series, blogging, focus on health care

Late Adopters and Laggards

• Not a focus this year. As implementation sites are evaluated, we can highlight wins and develop success stories.

From Digital Bridge Responsibilities:

• Develop and execute targeted marketing strategies to ensure uptake of solutions at a national level.
Upcoming

• Full communications plan and executive summary on Basecamp. Email jcook@phii.org with questions or comments.

• **Legal webinar** on Oct. 11. Will send information for promoting to your networks.

• Thank you!
Review | Decisions & Actions

Charlie Ishikawa
NEXT MEETING
Thursday, October 5th @ 12:00 – 1:30 PM EDT

NOTICE
January 2018 – 2-day In-person Governance Body Meeting