# HIEPI Technical Infrastructure Workgroup Meeting Minutes

| | |
|---|---|
| Meeting Owners | Vinod Brahmapuram, Co-Lead<br>Lee Jones, MAeHC/GSI, Facilitator |
| Agenda Author | Nael Hafez |
| Version | 1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Date | July 28, 2010 |
| Time | 10-12 PM |
| Location | Conference Call: (877) 449-6558;<br>Conference Code: 735 291 4860 |

## AGENDA

| Topic | Led By | Start | End |
|---|---|---|---|
| Roll Call/Attendance | Nael Hafez | 10:00 PM | 10:05 PM |
| Review of Project Progress to date | Lee Jones | 10:05 PM | 10:15 PM |
| Final Review of consensus areas – further thoughts/discussion | Lee Jones | 10:15 PM | 11:00 PM |
| Bullet responses to answer ONC requirements | Lee Jones | 11:00 PM | 11:30 PM |
| Pricing Models for State HIE Infrastructure | Lee Jones | 11:30 PM | 11:45 PM |
| Next Steps | Lee Jones | 11:45 PM | 12:00 PM |

## ATTENDEES

| Name | In Attendance (Y or N) | | Name | In Attendance (Y or N) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| David Towne | N | | Andrew Watt | N |
| Lee Jones | Y | | John Kelly | N |
| Nael Hafez | Y | | Elizabeth Collins | Y |
| Sharon Beaty | Y | | Elizabeth Shields | N |
| Mark Nightingale | Y | | Vinod Brahmapuram | Y |
| Bob Bridgham | Y | | Brian Richards | Y |
| Frank Catanese | Y | | | |

## GUESTS

| Name | In Attendance (Y or N) |
|---|---|
| Mark Belanger | Y |
| | |
| | |

* Via telephone

## MEETING HANDOUTS

1. Minutes from last week's summit.
2. Presentation – Discussion document

## MEETING SUMMARY

REVIEW OF PROJECT PROGRESS TO DATE

Same state as last week, with some new developments.
Focus on trying to quantify the cost
Required to produce a project plan (high level – cover bases of major considerations, activities and level of effort)
Strawman – Brainstorm activities with WG –
Need to get a draft as part of Operational Plan
Phasing across all working groups

PROJECT PLAN DISCUSSION

Options:

1. Leverage existing infrastructure (internal or neighboring state)
   Join or do something ourselves?
   What entity would we join, and what are their plans?

   Phase where NH gets more crisp about requirements
   1. Ask industry to propose something (RFI/RFP)
      a. Choose a reasonable solution and adopt a vendor strategy
   2. Spend time with State stakeholders in consensus based process and have detailed conversations resulting in concrete specification documentation – can happen before or after selection of technical partner; maintenance process for documentation and publication

   Q: Do we have to narrow down options and get specific about solution or keep things general?
   A: The thoughts are about how to get to a solution not based on a specific solution.

   Comments:
   - We need to come up with parameters; what are our objectives?
   - Need to do a detailed environmental scan and readiness assessment for all regions
   - Analysis of assessment will result in regional plans
   - Macro plan for building HIE state level infrastructure that would incorporate regional plans
   - Need to include these steps in the project plan.
   - We've already defined the scope for Phase 1; based on funding – narrowed our plan to borrow (insufficient funding to build).
   - Still need criteria to evaluate the systems we wish to 'borrow' from; details need to be refined.

2. Building vs buying

Steps/Activities:
RFI Process – high level NH objectives A starting point would be to incorporate current effort for SOP and environmental scan
RFI Evaluation Process - Coordinate responses from vendors; reflect and produce a final set of specs/requirements; evaluated by a group
RFP Process
RFP Evaluation Process – selection of technical partner.
Activity with stakeholders to understand local plans (regional)

Respondents to RFI or RFP could be a local group; neighboring state; or vendor.

Q: Is there any particular strategy to roll this process out across the state? (e.g. Statewide process; focus on key regions first; target specific segments based on particular criteria; target high priority use cases, etc.)

A: Staging and timing – need to bring value by bringing some volume of accessible data through HIE sooner than later in the process; a natural staging of which entities have a large patient population. Let's not try to boil the ocean; should focus on a specific use case(s) (e.g ED use case). Gives us focus on getting value from larger entities sooner than later.

Optimize approach to get as many patients to be covered as possible (more patients sooner) – hit the organizations that had more patients that they serve sooner (earlier in the process).

Need to examine the value proposition for the bigger entities (where is there the most financial return to help finance the HIE? Address sustainability model)

Should not get too fixated on the big guys and ignore the needs of the smaller folks; they are making decisions on whether to adopt technology in the next few years. They too need to see a return on investment. This should not get lost. This should be addressed in a parallel effort (outreach and planning) so that they understand their sequencing and phasing strategy; we should not focus exclusively on the big guys.

Q: Is it correct to state that our organizing principle of phasing would be along the lines of use cases, those transactions that would be applicable to the largest patient population?
A: Yes. A big factor is timing and limitation of current law; we need to focus on phase 1 use cases, and exhaust those before moving on to phase 2 – based on legislature and their timing.

Q: How would the state judge the completeness or the correct implementation by the selected vendor? How do we evaluate the outcomes? Does the state need an independent vendor (3rd party)?
A: Have a core technical team that understands the requirements and then we can establish our governance (technical and business/operational components).

Three phases for governance:

1. Current State governance/SC,
2. Stand up an independent 501c3 – July 2011
3. Interim governance (contractor? Hire extra folks at the state? Keep it voluntary?)

A third party evaluator would extend the workgroup, not supplant it.

Does everyone have access to MS Project? Not all; send as PDF. Mock up project plan is in excel.

FINAL REVIEW OF CONSENSUS AREAS

Lee reviewed consensus points using minutes from last meeting:

Consensus Point #1: Achieved consensus

Consensus Point #2: Achieved consensus

Consensus Point #3: Refined Statement – prefer SOAP/IHE and will incorporate NHIN Direct when/if we feel it's appropriate.

Consensus Point #4: Assistance strategy – allow local addressing but provide things like a provider index to support statewide exchange.

Consensus Point #5: As a posture - Limit access to PHI by HIE unless there is a clear reason/requirement (e.g. EMPI/RLS)
Reframed: While there are modes where the operator could allow the HIE to have access to PHI, we would want it configurable where it would not do so except for prescribed cases. Limit exposure of PHI for only those situations that would facilitated required transactions. Policy would determine or drive the decision to expose PHI to central HIE? Is it impossible? Or do we keep the option open with technical/policy controls to curtail it? We do not want to preclude anything; this should be driven by governance group. This decision has real impact on us.

*We do not want to limit the extensibility of architecture prematurely, knowing the other phases are coming. We want to be aggressive in incorporating MPI and RLS technology in our architecture in anticipation of future phases, but how and when we use them is subject to governance/policy. We do not want to be short sighted.*

It would be nice to know how effective purely push systems are? What problems do they typically run into? Any references?
Will bring this question to wider team tonight.

Consensus Point #6: Consensus is achieved.

Consensus Point #7: Consensus is achieved.

Consensus Point #8: Achieved consensus; one of the supported transactions is to 'push' a request for information; the response would be another push. Unsolicited is agreed upon. Unidirectional? Asynchronous would be a better term; all of the use cases are about sending

(pushing) information to an endpoint and not waiting for a response (other than the ACK – know transaction completed successfully). We're selling a secure exchange, so we need to ensure that what was sent was received? How would we acknowledge content? SHA-1 can be used; one way hashes to ensure integrity check.

Consensus Point #9: Consensus is achieved. Consent is managed locally; transaction would not need to carry consent to end points or enforced by HIE. Fairly significant undertaking for organizations to manage that; the project plan should reflect a phase or plan to outreach and educate participants on consent requirements. Should also include education on auditing scheme.

Consensus Point #10: Consensus is achieved.

Consensus Point #11: Consensus is achieved. Should we provide end points (local groups) with funding to assist them in getting plugged in? We need to anticipate and understand these costs and then make decisions about how to allocate.

SOP BULLETS

Review of the requirements and identification of any open items. Open item around VA, DOD and IHS connectivity; will be supported if/when we or they decide to get involved (if budget allows).

BUDGET – Cost Components

Review of HIE cost slides, based on research and models from other engagements. Based on CCD. Please review and bring forward any questions, comments or concerns.

CLOSING

We have a synchronization meeting today with the other WG so we will have more input, information, and details to share next week. The meeting next week will be held on Tuesday, August 3rd from 8-12 in Room 460 of the Brown building.

## Action Items (From previous meetings and new)

| Item # | Raised By | Action Item Description / Comment | Assigned To | Due Date | Status/ Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |

## ISSUES IDENTIFIED

| Issue # | Raised By | Issue Description | Assigned To | Due Date | Status/Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

## DECISIONS MADE (SEE CONSESUS ITEMS ABOVE).

| Decision # | Sponsor | Decision Description | Approved (Y or N) | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |