

# Meeting Minutes

## Digital Bridge Interim Governance Body

### Meeting Information

---

<b>Objectives:</b>	(1) Identify the status of Digital Bridge eCR scalability assessment work, (2) identify in-person meeting’s framework and objectives, and (3) identify draft Digital Bridge sustainability plan’s essential elements for in-person meeting discussion.		
<b>Date:</b>	January 4, 2018	<b>Location:</b>	1-866-516-9291
<b>Time:</b>	12:00 – 1:30 PM EST	<b>Meeting Type:</b>	Virtual
<b>Called By:</b>	Project Management Office	<b>Facilitator:</b>	John Lumpkin
<b>Timekeeper:</b>	Charles Ishikawa	<b>Note Taker:</b>	Jelisa Lowe and Hoa Truong
<b>Attendees:</b>	See attached		

Agenda Items		Presenter	Time Allotted
1	Call to Order and Roll Call	John Lumpkin / Charlie Ishikawa	4 min
2	Agenda Review and Approval	John Lumpkin	1 min
3	Scalability Assessment Update	Jim Jellison	10 min
4	In-person Meeting Preparation	Charlie Ishikawa	10 min
5	Digital Bridge Strategy	Alana Cheeks-Lomax / Ben Stratton	65 min
6	Announcements and Adjournment	Charlie Ishikawa / John Lumpkin	Remaining

### Decisions

- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None.</li> </ul> |
|---|---|
-

New Action Items	Responsible	Due Date
A. None.		

## 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. **Scalability Assessment Update** –
  - A. This activity was intended to examine the current eCR approach being used for the initial implementations to identify potential legal or regulatory issues that may impede or complicate future implementations. For the current implementations, the decision support intermediary (DSI) acts as a business associate (BA) of the health care provider sending case reports. As a BA, the DSI has privacy breach risks associated with HIPAA. In addition, there are potential administrative costs of managing business associate agreements (BAAs). It is suggested that instead of acting as a BA of health care providers, the project management office (PMO) should consider that instead of a BA, the DSI should act as an agent of the public health agency.
  - B. The preliminary findings table (slide 9) summarizes aspects of the current eCR approach, potential scalability issues and potential modifications to address those issues. The responses summarize feedback from the technical architecture workgroup and the implementation task force. Workgroup stakeholders think the liability associated with the DSI acting as a BA may be a selling point, and administrative costs associated with managing agreements could be mitigated through trusted exchange frameworks. In response to the second issue, workgroup members think that the primary case adjudication logic (reportable conditions trigger codes, or RCTC) is based on reasonable suspicion for reportable cases, and there aren't sufficient resources to re-engineer the DSI for de-identified case reports. For the third issue, the workgroup members generally thought that it is not technically feasible to distribute both the primary and secondary case adjudication logics for HIEs.
  - C. The assessment is ongoing. The next legal and regulatory workgroup call will explore these issues further, including the idea of reasonable suspicion and how it relates to the RCTC. The group is ultimately preparing for an in-depth discussion at the in-person meeting, hoping for consensus on the scalability issues associated with the current approach and to agree on a path forward to address those issues.
  - D. **Discussion:**
    - None.
4. **In-Person Meeting Preparation** –
  - A. The PMO is still fine tuning details on timing but have agreed on the theme regroup, reflect, refresh and course correct.
  - B. Meeting objectives include: (1) to better ensure implementation and evaluation of Digital Bridge eCR approach; (2) to review scalability issues and discuss potential technical and legal solutions; (3) to identify issues or questions central to ensuring adequate eCR governance and sustainability nationwide; (4) to determine ways to advance Digital Bridge sustainability; and (5) to identify and document how the Digital Bridge founding organizations will advance strategic priorities over the next 12-18 months.
  - C. The diagram of Digital Bridge processes and components was created to build a framework that can organize conversations during the in-person meeting and to understand impacts and decisions. The diagram represents activities and processes that the PMO leads and provides a high-level picture of the current state of Digital Bridge. Different components of the diagram draw to specific objectives from the in-person meeting to highlight relationships and key focuses (slide 13).
  - D. **Discussion:**
    - None.

---

## 5. Digital Bridge Strategy –

- A. Alana Cheeks-Lomax and Ben Stratton walked through the three key components of the sustainability plan: the operations model, in/out activities, and Digital Bridge and eCR sustainability. The presentation and discussion will be used to inform a more robust conversation during the in-person meeting.
- B. **General feedback and plan highlights:** Generally, governance body members are sure the plan is moving in the right direction, but there are gaps that need to be addressed as they learn more from implementation sites. One piece of feedback the strategy workgroup wants to focus on is measuring actual economic benefits from Digital Bridge and accurate time contributions for all involved parties. The team created a one-pager that highlights the primary components of the plan and suggestions on ways to move forward: create an organizational structure with three major work streams (project management, incubation, operations coordination); create an extensive list of Digital Bridge activities to support operations; suggest forming a new governance structure that includes a board of directors, members and staff; use businesses and operating models to support use case development, launch and implementation; and enforce a process to solicit and approve future use cases.
- C. **Digital Bridge Operating Model:** The strategy workgroup developed an operating model for Digital Bridge organized by key players (board of directors, members and staff) and focus areas for each (strategic objectives, processes, technology and project management). Processes include tactical tasks to complete to support the Digital Bridge mission; technology refers to the infrastructure, currently the DSI; and project management involves how to manage new use cases. The operating model is intended to support two functions of Digital Bridge: incubating new use cases and coordinating operations for managing use cases after a given stage of launch.
- **Discussion:**
    - This infrastructure will be refined based on lessons learned, and we may need to regularly assess standards and make recommendations to the bodies who create them.
    - Consider the Idea of advocacy: to be able to drive initial use in getting people to come on board with use cases instead of general useful specifications that don't get used in the industry. Switch presentations from informative to persuasive in order to drive support and uptake of these activities—take advantage of the key members we have in our group.
    - Need more details on who the national operator will be and details on going to scale. We need to think about how quickly and how large a scale we want to move forward with Digital Bridge.
- D. **Digital Bridge In/Out Activities:** This is a list of activities that Digital Bridge is and is not responsible for, and it supports the goal of improving nationwide health. At a high level, Digital Bridge is responsible for incubation and hand-off, coordination, forming a board of directors, and estimating costs to run several use cases simultaneously. These activities build off of the operating model.
- **Discussion:**
    - Can we handle more than one use case at a time for several years with only 12 full-time employees (FTEs) (slide 32)?
      - It would depend on availability of resources, which could be difficult due to federal and organizational cutbacks. It also depends on the complexity of a use case: if it's something simple, then 12 FTEs should suffice.
    - There is a lot of concern about the model. The membership model alone is at 50 percent, and it's unclear where the \$6 million membership funds would come from. Also, the number of FTEs is underestimating the work of current implementations.
      - The number of FTEs is only linked to PMO efforts that need to align with the organizational structure. The strategy workgroup will take into consideration the amount of effort outside of the PMO and include those estimations in future versions of the sustainability plan.
      - The number of FTEs decline as the project progresses because over time, the use case will be handed over to the partners selected to carry it out. Meanwhile, the rest of the
-

---

Digital Bridge staff will be moving on to the next use case. The chart only considers a single use case.

- The strategy workgroup needs to add more substance to membership details (e.g., fee schedule, membership level, public- vs. private-sourced, etc.)
- E. **Digital Bridge and eCR Sustainability:** Scalability and sustainability are aligned and linked to each other. There are incubation, hand-off, coordination and operations support periods. The use case operating model shows where specific activities will come into play. The strategy workgroup realized gaps around scalability and legal and regulatory support, so they put together a list of things that need to get done within six months and within 12-18 months.
- **Discussion:**
    - Having both Digital Bridge and eCR sustainability grouped together in the sustainability plan was confusing to some. A piece of feedback received was that there wasn't enough clarity around the national operator. The national operator is meant to be a neutral term that could include current partners.
      - It is evident that it's still necessary to focus on eCR and consider whether or not it is legitimate to ask states to review eCR and then shift their focus on something else. Manpower and resources have to be considered in order to ask that. From a practical point of view, the focus should continue to be on eCR; shifting the focus to building Digital Bridge as an organization is a deterrent from moving forward.
    - In-kind contributions from all governance body organizations has been significant, and there should be more discussion about that during the in-person meeting in late January.
6. **Review Decisions and Actions –**
- A. The next governance body meeting will be in person January 24-25, 2018
  - B. Communicate to Sara or Charlie any logistical issues regarding the in-person meeting
  - C. Let Sara or Charlie know of any logistics issues
  - D. Share with Charlie any additional expectations members may have for the in-person meeting
7. **Adjourned.**
-