

Meeting Minutes

Digital Bridge Interim Governance Body

Meeting Information

Objective:	(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 alternate eCR approaches, (4) provide insights to improve the development of strategic plans for the Digital Bridge, and (5) discuss and identify ways that the governance body has and may continue to support communication goals.		
Date:	September 7, 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, Hoa Truong
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	Overall Status Report: Initiative Roadmap and eCR Timeline	Jim Jellison	5 min
4	Progress: Wave 1 and 2 Implementations	Benson Chang / Rob Brown	35 min
5	Update: Legal and Regulatory	Walter Suarez	10 min
6	Issue Brief: Alternative eCR Approaches	Jim Jellison	10 min
7	Digital Bridge Funding Analysis	Ben Stratton / Benson Chang	5-10 min
8	Feedback on Funding Analysis	Governance Body	10-15 min
9	Digital Bridge Communications	Jessica Cook / Jelisa Lowe	10-15 min
10	Review and Adjournment	Charlie Ishikawa / John Lumpkin	Remaining

Decisions

- None.

New Action Items

	Responsible	Due Date
A.		
B.		

Other Notes & Information

1. **Call to Order** – Quorum was not met (however, there are no items on the agenda that require a vote).
2. **Agenda Review and Approval** – Dr. Lumpkin reviewed the agenda. There were no additions.
3. **Overall Status Report: Initiative Roadmap and eCR Timeline** –
 - A. **Project Timeline:** The project management team has developed an updated timeline that reflects the current state of the workgroups and the eCR implementations. As this year closes, Digital Bridge will be deciding on the next use case and discussing plans for the transition of eCR to a sustainable foundation. There will be an in-person governance body meeting in January where most of these decisions will be made. The PMO is thinking through both a short-term approach for the eCR implementation and a longer term legal framework for future eCR implementations. That will entail cross pollination with discussions on how the eCR technical approach will evolve. There will be at least one Wave 1 implementation site running by the end of this calendar year—but no later than Feb. 2018—with initial conditions that the decision support intermediary (DSI) is ready to support. Concurrently, there will be evaluations of those implementations. An evaluation plan is expected to be ready in October, and that plan will be executed with the sites that are in production.
4. **eCR Implementation** –
 - A. **Progress: Wave 1 and 2 Implementations:**
 - **Risks and Issues:** Since the last meeting, there has been full mitigation for risk number one: Epic has pushed up their timeline, and that software is now available for implementation. The implementation taskforce is working with partners at APHL and CSTE to assess readiness and determine if any changes are needed to the implantation timeline. The team is also currently going through additional work and analysis with Cerner and Intermountain on their approach to eCR.
 - **Site Status:** Rob Brown gave a high-level overview of current implementation site activities. The team is making good progress on implementations besides risks and issues. Cerner and Intermountain’s development work can be used for Kansas, and its public health partner has completed connectivity with AIMS. The team is working with two sample eCRs they have for Wave 1 sites as test scenarios while continuing to wait for the full test data package.
 - **Implementation Timeline:** Nine test scenarios have been sent to Lantana, and CDC and CSTE are working on narratives from them. The completion date is by the end of September. Performance testing. Performance testing is an iterative process, and four have been completed so far.
 - B. **Legal and Regulatory Update:** Walter Suarez reviewed the three legal options for implementing eCR. After completing review of these options, the legal and regulatory workgroup started a dual path of work. One is short term between now and November and involved DWT drafting agreements for the sites and conducting legal work using the approach outlined in options three. They will follow up with legal contractual points of contact and prioritize actions with the implementation sites. The next group meeting is Sept. 13. Draft agreements will be ready for review and later executed in Nov. The long-term strategy, which will take us to Q1 of 2018, considers work for options one and two and gathers feedback from experience of implementation sites to develop a final scalable approach that will be recommended to the governance body after the analysis is complete.
 - C. **Alternative eCR Approaches:** The Michigan site proposed two projects. Both leveraged a health information exchange (HIE), MiHIN. In one approach, MiHIN would serve as an intermediary to the DSI. The other approach had MiHIN sourcing the eCRs from clinical documents received from the provider.

Stakeholders part of the Digital Bridge collaborative expressed concerns about the data quality—completeness, timeliness and scalability—of the eCRs from an HIE if we found that different jurisdictions and clinical partners are implementing eCR in two heterogeneous fashions. Michigan withdrew the controversial approach, but it left key implementation questions unanswered: (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?

Digital Bridge will continue to support Michigan in the other approach. What we're finding is that Digital Bridge has increased the awareness of electronic case reporting and the technical infrastructure, and it's getting attention and adoption from clinical entities and from state and local public health agencies. This fosters a constructive conversation around how eCR could evolve. It is likely that HIEs will need to play a role. Some jurisdictions will likely be required to use HIEs for routing or for a source for eCRs. In some instances, it's not easy to distinguish a large, integrated delivery network from an HIE.

D. **Discussion on Issue Brief:**

- Mary Ann Cooney: When will we have an opportunity to thoroughly discuss these three questions?
- Jim Jellison: These could be substantive enough – could form a workgroup, but that's to be determined. We will need to include technical and legal/regulatory considerations. One dependency is the work on the legal framework and what technical decisions need to be made. We can launch workgroup by the end of the calendar year, but we need to learn about the issues that need to be addressed. There could be more issues/details than the three here.
- Mary Ann Conney: I'm especially interested in the third question for if any site comes to us. The governance body is the decision making group, but it needs information to do so.
- Art Davidson: It's important to recognize that local conditions are drivers. As long as they adhere to the standards that Digital Bridge is setting up, why would we stop them?
- Dr. Lumpkin: Definitely need to have the conversation. When looking at the three architectures, it's more about what are the standards and robustness.
- Richard H.: Digital Bridge needs to be prepared to handle what happens in the market and field and be able to address them
- Walter: It would be helpful for us to have an evaluation checklist on meeting the basic elements and the standards to evaluate alternative approaches, and beyond that, they can do whatever they want

5. **Digital Bridge Strategy** – The strategy workgroup took a slight hiatus in August and has now returned. During that time, the workgroup has been working on ad hoc strategy meetings to talk through deliverables for the fall—one thing is both the Digital Bridge and eCR sustainability plans. Final approval from the governance body is needed by November. The workgroup also worked on a funding model to figure out what it would take to sustain Digital Bridge activities beyond the eCR use case.

- A. **Funding Analysis:** Ben Stratton reviewed the funding dashboard the strategy workgroup designed. It outlines how much Digital Bridge will cost in the future to understand the financial needs for operating the initiative. It takes into account different activities identified as critical for the success of Digital Bridge and its projects. The other aspect of the funding model was looking at different revenue streams that will be able to support Digital Bridge in the future. Those include grants, membership fees, contracts and fee for service.
- B. **Sustainability Plan:** Ben also shared a brief outline of the sustainability plan. It has two parts. The first part will focused on the overall organizational structure and business model for the Digital Bridge. It also includes long-term maintenance and financial support. The second part will focus on eCR.

6. **Digital Bridge Communications** –

A. **Accomplishments:**

- Communications plan, supporting materials and visual identity—new website, logo, talking points, etc.
- Six placements in relevant trade publications mainly geared toward health care and health IT audiences.
- Presented in over 25 outside presentations and at five major conferences in the last year.

-
- Website traffic is steadily growing.
 - Public health support with spreading Digital Bridge content on their own channels to expand reach.
 - Outside firm was hired to develop a communications plan, an infographic, an icon, a messaging map and a presentation template for eCR.

B. Challenges:

- Large, fragmented audiences.
- Driving home the message that Digital Bridge and eCR are not the same.

7. Announcements and Adjournment

- A. Dedicate governance body conversation around the issue brief and content that was presented
- B. Next meeting will take place October 5.
- C. There will be a two-day in-person meeting in January in Atlanta.