Meeting Minutes

Type of Meeting  Monthly Commission Meeting
Facilitator  Jason Greer, Co-Chair
Note Taker  Lauren West
Timekeeper
Commission Attendees  Michele Lueck, Marc Lassaux, Sarah Nelson, Carrie Paykoc, Chris Underwood, Justin Wheeler, Wes Williams, Adam Brown, Ann Boyer, Morgan Honea, Jon Gottsegen, Jason Greer

Minutes

Call to Order

• Jason Greer called the meeting to order as acting Co-Chair of the eHealth Commission

Approval of Minutes

• Attendance constitutes a quorum; April Minutes are accepted.

Review of Agenda

• Jason Greer, Co-Chair

Announcements

OeHI Updates - Carry Paykoc, Interim Director, Office of eHealth Innovation

• Submitted HITECH funding request to CMS on March 4th. The request is for a multiyear match at the full 90% match.
  o Chris Underwood - Our CMS analysts have pushed back that they are overwhelmed by the number of submissions. They are under no federal requirement to approve the submission within 60 days. Any help would be good.
  o The Commission approves drafting a letter of support to submit to CMS and creating a template for organizations to use.

• Following last month’s discussion OeHI is looking at making all of our workgroups open to the public.

Workgroup Updates - Carrie Paykoc, Interim Director, Office of eHealth Innovation

• Marc - Do you have a specific help request for the 10.10.10 project?
  o Carrie - as we pull together mapping it would be great for commissioners to pull together maps as well.

• The eCQM workgroup needs a commission sponsor, email Carrie if you are interested

• Tania is stepping down so there is a need for commission involvement in the Consumer Engagement Workgroup. Email Carrie if you are interested

Commissioner Announcements

• Wes - Mental Health Denver is starting an innovation lab to look at issues like access to care, patient engagement, and efficacy. We are starting the job search, if you know of anyone who would be good for the position please refer them to me.

• Carrie - The Prime Health Summit was yesterday. We had close to 400 people attend. Our Federal partners attended and participated in a way they haven’t before.
  o Marc - really good rural component of the discussion

• Morgan - I was in Omaha talking about the Support Act which is a 100% match. There was talk
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about a tentative extension of the timeline for PDMPs.

- Jason Greer - I was elected to a workshop to design a national model for data strategy. There is a possibility of using Colorado’s model as a national template. If people are interested in assisting in the design, please let me know.

New Business

Introduction and Briefing on Legal Framework Approach for Data Sharing - Lisa Neal Graves, Chief Innovation Officer, Office of the Attorney General

- The AGs office always gets questions on data and data sharing, the challenge varies by section. How can we bring them all together?
- How can we support organizations at a state level for data sharing?
- The AGs office has an internal workgroup to build out a framework for data sharing.
- The workgroup is look at how we can give council to other State agencies and how we can provide leadership on data sharing.
- Our goal is to create something that is a living process that allows us to grow as technology develops.
- Right now, we are working to figure out how we take data that needs to be shared with law enforcement. We are creating a legal framework; the work is still ongoing.
- A result of this work has been discovering foundational legal issues for any data sharing that we need to look at first.
- Question and Answer
  - Please provide information to the eHealth Commission so we know when the workgroup meetings are.
  - Morgan - Hope your approach is how do we share the data, not why can’t we. Are you also looking from the perspective not just of internal state agencies but also stakeholders beyond state agencies?
  - Lisa - We are treating the work with internal state agencies as a jump off for working with outside stakeholders.


- There has been significant business case development and investment in existing infrastructure in partnership with CORHIO, QHN, and CCMCN.
- With CHI we have developed a framework to validate data. Take the data from the eHR, validate the data then send to practices. Practices validate the data we calculated if there is a difference we work directly with the practice.
- Governance is so important for the eCQMs with so many different partners involved. We spent a lot of time on policies and procedures for data flow.
- We are getting into use cases for how to leverage this work beyond SIM. We have created an evaluation process for use cases.
  - Ex: Public Health for quality measures, physicians that are splitting between practices
- There are 3 main pillars for sustaining the work. There is a lot that still needs to be developed. The most important thing is to stay relevant to practices.
- We have a high-level project plan for the transition.
- Carrie - OeHI has carved out an amount from our budget to take over the SIM contract to ensure continuity.
  - Ask: OeHI is spinning up a workgroup we are looking for commissioner to chair and recommendations for workgroup members. We reached out to members of the SIM workgroup to see if they are interested.
- Michele Lueck - Where is the funding coming from?
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JointAgency Interoperability Update and Governance Discussion - Sarah Nelson, Business Technology Director, Department of Human Services

- We want to make the data available at the right time for the right person without permanently moving data from the source or making it permanently available in other systems.
  - Use Case - county office
- Put in place enterprise services at a state level then we can connect different systems from outside and around the state.
- Selected 4 big systems from Human Services. We are driving to a case worker view that will give availability in a single place to see if the client is in other systems, has a case in other systems.
  - Michele Lueck - We have heard about Zoma and Boulder Connect etc., what is the relationship between these?
  - They are complimentary projects, we need to work on how they all work together, complimentary not duplicative or competitive. The Case worker screen is only about 3% done, to show to state legislature.
- Boulder Connect is getting data through an old process, in the future the organization will plug system in, and we can control the data that is flowing to them.
- Wes - Leaving it up to the case worker to say the system has the data wrong. We need to think forward to when we are plugging all in, we will need a mechanism to resolve differences in the data. How do we decide what the truth is?
- We need to get a legal frame work in place and improve standardization. There is a lot of work ahead before providing decision support. Right now, we are just telling that a person is in the system but not why they are in the system.
- Michelle - How are these projects aligned and complimentary instead of redundant?
  - Carrie - Under care coordination our task is to prevent duplication. There is no one pager on how these things fit together. There is a gap here for Commissioners to be involved. OeHI could pull together a one pager on the landscape including the relationship between state and county investments. There are some key questions at a high level that the Commission might want to discuss.
  - Chris - There is a big distinction between the case worker view and Boulder Connect. The case worker view is very specific to case work that is in all 4 systems, Boulder Connect is used by community organizations too. What data they can actually get is raising a lot of interesting legal questions. We made the wrong assumption that if the client gives consent that the data can be pulled out of the source system.
- Marc - You want a single sign-in on that screen internally then the data would be available via API. Communities need to understand that it works different in their communities
- Michele Lueck - This is like a highway that we can send to the counties.
- Carrie - We need an understanding of the mechanism and the future vision. There are also Roadmap investments that go into this. If there are blockages, who do we work with? Data governance hasn’t been completely approved by the system.
  - We are building governance not just technology.
- Theresa - For Data sharing and privacy there are other States that are doing things in this area, this might be a source to go to. They have already negotiated with the Federal government and gotten answers. We might be able to work with other states.
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- Chris - Sometimes Federal partners give different answers to us and other States. It would be nice to get a more uniform answer from federal sources.
- Theresa - It would be useful to see if there is a set of key questions we are trying to get answers to and have a call with other States CIO’s. We could do a uniform ask to the federal agencies.
- Carrie - CBMS ESC had high a level discussion on who should govern and how to make sure all stakeholders are represented.
- Marc - This is moving agonizingly slow; the State keeps putting brakes on sharing data. Are there some low hanging fruit?
- Most of you have done work in the HIPAA environment, there are 4 different federal agencies that regulate the other data sources, with different types of regulations. We don’t have the capacity yet to get through this process we will eventually run into policy issues that could go to federal level.
  - Jon - One thing this project is highlighting is that there has been a risk in the way data has been shared in-State and we didn’t know the risk.
  - Marc - how can the eHealth Commission help move this along?
  - In February we just added to the scope and that is still a very limited scope. There is all of this other work where we could benefit from setting the next steps together.
- Wes - As you explain the complexities just within the State and the different federal oversight, it’s important that we don’t get to a point where it gets stuck at the State. I am excited around bidirectional feeds, but it feels like there have been examples where we solve a limited problem too fast and can't expand on it.
  - Michele Lueck - Are we trying to do too much at one time?
  - Jason - Protecting person privacy is the thing that creates the breaks, it becomes a multiyear process. Small projects are the way forward because it allows us to control person privacy. Large projects, right-off the bat are just a big lumbering process.
- We are investing in tools and an approach that OIT is supporting so that other agencies can use the technology. So as additional use cases arrive, we have the technology already in place.
- Theresa - Project governance around health care is structured differently, we need to just consider that, it may need to be managed at a governance level differently.
- Jon - With data sharing problems the key to success, so far, is to have a very concrete use case. What are the questions that are generally applicable that help guide the more general data sharing?
- Morgan - I have teams ready to go on this yet here we are 2 years later. What I am hearing you say is stop your work.
- Carrie - The immediate need relates to Boulder Connect. OIT and CDHS need to come back with ways that compliance can be fixed. They need to come back to Commission with specific steps and timelines to continue this conversation. We have been slowly working on this.
  - We have provided options to Boulder Connect and they are considering the options.
- Michele Lueck - It is important to understand at a strategic level where the overlap is in these conflicting systems. We need to have the detail to know that this is a good use of finite resources.
- Jason - We should bring this topic back in a future meeting. Is there an intersection that the Committee could support, we really need to dig into it.

State Health IT Architecture - Jason Webster, Health IT Architect, HealthTech Solutions

- We looked at State wide systems, what they do and how they are connected to each other and worked into one document.
- None of the systems that are designated as sunset made it into the drawing, and only one new system.
- There is a delivery network in place but not much connectivity between that and the end of the map that has HITECH work.
- Carrie - This is a Roadmap initiative, nothing existed on paper before. State agencies need to
understand who the players are. We should talk about JAI and how the counties fit into this map.

• Morgan - It’s interesting that you said there is very little connection between this side and that side. We have the connections built but we are stymied, there aren’t many path ways and the one we have is being blocked.
  o A legal framework is the most important thing moving forward
• Marc - what are the processes for updates, comments etc.
  o Periodic updates work best, if you continuously update people stop trusting the map because they don’t know which version they are looking at.
• Several technically different efforts, when you dig down, the same companies are the back bone but it’s difficult because the companies are in competition.
• Next steps include building a library of existing use cases and create a process for moving forward.
• Theresa - How does the map compare to other states?
  o It’s very similar, everyone is interpreting the same federal regulations. Systems are conceptualized differently but at the base are very similar.
  o Theresa - Are the federal groups on Sarah's chart something that should be added to the map, could it give us a more detailed view?
  o Jason - We should set up meeting to go over the map.

Public Comment Period

Public Comments
• Mary Ellen Holland - With all of the data sharing will there by a policy in place to protect the privacy of citizens?
  o Lisa Neal Graves- Should we have a policy state wide that protects citizens, yes but it needs to be within federal guidelines. The initiative is to figure out what is the best way to get a model that is viable and sustainable. We need a methodology that will work in that moment in that case. We are focused on CO citizens, but it has to be in the context of federal law.

Closing Remarks
• None

Meeting Adjourned