

HIEPI Finance Workgroup Meeting (Teleconference #1)

Meeting Owners	Shanthi Venkatesan Micky Tripathi
Minutes Author	Sean Kelly
Version	1

Date	24-Jun-10
Time	10am EST
Location	Teleconference

AGENDA

Topic	Led By	Start	End
1) Introduction	Shanthi	10:00	10:20
2) Review WG charter	Micky	10:20	10:23
3) Review overall approach and WG roles, responsibilities, and inter-dependencies	Micky	10:23	10:45
4) Review ONC award: amount, duration, phasing, matching requirements	Micky	10:45	10:57
5) Review ONC budget and program & financial control requirements	Micky	10:45	10:57
6) Review expectations of ONC deliverable regarding financing and sustainability models	Micky	10:57	11:00
7) Discuss approaches for financing HIE activities	Micky	10:57	11:00
a. High-Level Review of Utah, New Mexico, and Maryland approaches	Assigned for WG Summit #1		
b. High Level Discussion of framework for financing options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Public vs. private ii. Investment vs. recurring iii. Subscription vs. transaction iv. Other approaches? 	Micky	10:23	10:45

ATTENDEES

Name	In Attendance (Y or N)	Name	In Attendance (Y or N)
Shanthi Venkatesan (WG Lead)	Y	Evalie Crosby	Y
Micky Tripathi (Facilitator)	Y	Leslie Randazzo	N
Sean Kelly (Analyst)	Y	Kathy Bizarro	N
Jeff Watson	Y	Dick LaFleur	N
Tyler Brannen	Y	David Briden	N
Barbara Richardson	Y	Catherine Golas	N
Alisa Druzba	Y		

GUESTS

Name	In Attendance (Y or N)
None	

* Via telephone

MEETING HANDOUTS

1. HIEPI Workgroup Charters 06 18 10.pdf 
HIEPI_Workgroup
Charters 06 18 10.pdf
2. HIEPI Finance WG 25-Jun 10 
HIEPI Finance
WG-25 Jun 10.pdf
3. Finance Workgroup Agenda for Teleconference 1 24-Jun-10 
Finance Workgroup
Agenda for Teleconfe

MEETING SUMMARY

Introduction & Roll-call

Reviewed Agenda (HIEPI Finance WG Agenda)

- We reviewed the multiple Workgroup (WG) process and how they interact.
- We discussed the FOA as the requirements defining document articulating what the Strategic and Operational Plan (SOP) requires. We explained how the required detailed content aligned with the 5 domains we have a WG for, including the Finance WG.
- The Strategic Plan will articulate the vision for statewide HIE, while the Operational Plan will define how the funding will achieve that vision.
- While we will focus on these deliverables, we will strive to focus on the longer term plan, the vision for NH HIE.
- We discussed that the finance content and how it must address the budget for Operational Plan, including how the \$5.5 Million allocated will be matched through state funding.
- We also discussed that the Finance WG will need to define the required Program and Financial Controls for managing funding for statewide HIE and the Business plan for a long-term sustainability model.
- We introduced some of the approaches that other states have published and will address the 3 ONC-approved plans at the 6/30 face-to-face next week. We asked everyone to review the UT, NM, and MD approved plans and specifically their approach to financing.
- We listed that several frameworks exist for financing options/models including public vs. private, investment vs. recurring, subscription vs. transaction fees, and that there may be others to begin discussing in our face-to-face on 6/30.

WG Charter

- We reviewed the Workgroup charter and articulated how it is defined in line with ONC guidance. It was left open for comment. (HIEPI Workgroup Charters)

Overall Approach and process of how other WGs will work together for ONC SOP deliverable by end of August (HIEPI Finance WG slide deck)

- We explained the Use Case Inventory & Prioritization process as a defined prioritizing of the use cases accomplished via a statewide HIE that the Business and Operation WG is reviewing.
- We defined how HIE Building Blocks can be used to build HIEs efficiently. That is, specific strategic objectives and use cases can be accomplished through an efficient assessment of the required functionality. For example, by deploying secure routing, registry reporting, shared services & community record with the appropriate policy, business and technology components, NH could accomplish several use cases at once. An example of how secure routing of documents and registries could be leveraged to send referrals/consult

notes between a primary care physician (PCP) and specialist, as well as between a PCP and a hospital, hospital and PCP/specialist, as well as labs.

- We briefly discussed that our lens should be where we can gain some efficiency from a financial perspective.
- As an overall process, these HIE Building Blocks will be reviewed from each domain's perspective and then feed into a phased HIE roadmap that will be in the SOP.
- We explained that the Business and Technology Operations WG has begun to review these use cases and will feed the other WGs for domain specific considerations.
- A Questions was raised about whether private funding could impact use case selection – We discussed that it would be factored in the use case prioritization, and that we will need to examine the value of those use cases and balance it against the required objectives and synergies while recognizing that someone is willing to pay for a particular functionality and that may demonstrate significant value for sustainability and support.
- We discussed how the starting set of use cases was influenced by the requirements that Federal dollars must work toward meaningful use requirements, as well as those in demand by the Business and Operations WG stakeholders.
- We explained how many of these use cases have evolved to include definitions of the parties involved, the payload used, when it occurs in the care continuum, and the required technical standard that may or may not be clearly defined by ONC.
- We explained how a Prioritization Matrix will be used to define urgency and demand as against a level of complexity to institute a use case in order to determine prioritization. This may also be augmented by other sources of funding such as the possibility of taking advantage of funding sources such as Medicare/Medicaid.
- We talked about some key considerations for an HIE building block:
 - We discussed how a recognized citywide lab results system in Indianapolis was financed by hospitals who found significant savings if using a public utility to transmit reports.
 - Conversely, we discussed how a service such as a centralized patient matching with managed consent may be useful, but may not be something that connected entities are willing to finance and may need to leverage more of the ONC award rather than private funding.

Review of ONC award & How to meet Matching requirement to ONC award

- We reviewed the ONC award information and the 4 year project/budget period that runs through 2014.
- The award amount is \$5,457, 856.
- The Federal share was determined via population, care, Medicaid, and physician volume.
- The state's matching component is \$811,000 and NH plans an aggressive spending schedule to minimize its matching obligations because the matching schedule increases in penalty as the timeline moves toward year 4 of the project.
- We explained that we will have to examine to fund this in order to receive the \$5.5M Federal award as matching is required for funding receipt. Shanthi offered to bring the current spending schedule to the 6/30 WG summit.
- We explained that the matching solution must be defined soon as it begins on 10/1/10 for 2011.
- Shanthi explained that up to 6/2011, the state will try and provide match internally and this was recently proposed to the Commissioner. We also explained that additional alternatives such as a bond issuance were proposed.
- The Nationwide/Interstate Health information activity and the Sub-national/regional intrastate HIT activity were briefly discussed as required elements even though the requirements remain vague.
- We discussed the Approved Funding Detail and how a preliminary budget with placeholder dollars was developed in October 2009. We expect this will be revisited and differ in detail as we move through the SOP development.

Next Steps:

- We are scheduled for the first WG face-to-face on 6/30.
- We plan to review various models from the UT, MD, and NM ONC-approved plans and asked WG members to review prior to the summit.
- We set a goal of beginning to define the various financing dimensions and the pros and cons of each and bundle them into reasonable options as well as a feasibility rank.

ACTION ITEMS (FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND NEW)

Item #	Raised By	Action Item Description / Comment	Assigned To	Due Date	Status/ Remarks
1	Micky Tripathi	Review 3 ONC-approved state SOP plans (UT, NM, MD) for WG Summit on 30-Jun-10	All WG members	6/30	Assignment

ISSUES IDENTIFIED

Issue #	Raised By	Issue Description	Assigned To	Due Date	Status/Remarks
1	Micky Tripathi,	Introduction of Financing Issues including: a) How do we plan to allocate the ONC funding? b) How will the state matching be addressed? c) What use cases/models can be supported through funding outside of ONC? d) What have other states/entities done that works/doesn't work for NH? e) Impact of delayed spending – requires greatest threshold of state matching as timeline moves out.	All WG Members	To begin addressing on 6/30	

DECISIONS MADE

Decision #	Sponsor	Decision Description	Approved (Y or N)	Comments
1				