

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
State Innovation Model
Health Information Technology (HIT) Council
Meeting Summary
Friday, September 18, 2015
10:00-12:00p.m.

Location: Room 1B of the Legislative Office Building, 300 Capitol Avenue Hartford, CT

Members Present: Roderick Bremby; Patricia Checko; Anthony Dias; Michael Hunt; Vanessa Kapral; Matthew Katz; Jessica DeFlumer-Trapp; Mike Miller; Mark Raymond; Philip Renda; Amanda Skinner; Sheryl Turney; Victor Villagra; Josh Wojcik; Moh Zaman

Members Absent: Thomas Agresta; Anne Camp; Tiffany Donelson; Ludwig Johnson; Alan Kaye

Other Participants: Ian Goldsweig; Michelle Moratti; Minakshi Tikoo

The meeting was called to order at 10:00am. Commissioner Roderick Bremby and Mark Raymond co-chaired the meeting.

1. Introductions

Commissioner Bremby initiated roll call. Council members announced themselves.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Minutes

Mark Raymond motioned to approve the August 21st meeting minutes. Matt Katz seconded the motion and the minutes were approved. Patricia Checko abstained. Mr. Katz remarked that while the minutes clearly reflect what was discussed during the August 21st meeting, he urged the Project Management Office (PMO) to be timely in the disbursement of materials.

4. HIT Charter Update

Michelle Moratti of The Chartis Group reviewed feedback on the HIT Council's Charter by the Quality Council (QC) and Health Information Steering Committee (HISC). The most notable suggested revisions to the HIT Charter, were to strike item's two and three under "Quality," which the QC interpreted as an assertion of authority and control over the definition of metrics as well as insert language that emphasizes the collaborative nature of the Work Groups. Additionally, the HISC suggested the HIT Charter include a "Guiding Principles" section, outlined in the HIT Council's September 18th presentation, available [here](#).

Mr. Katz suggested a redline version of the Charter be brought forth to better track the suggested edits by the HISC and QC. Ms. Moratti and Ian Goldsweig of The Chartis Group presented a redlined version of the HIT Charter to the Council.

Mr. Katz remarked that the two entities suggested changes that are inconsistent with one another, and asked what revisions are suggested, and which are required, citing the deliberate and specific nature with which the items in HIT Council's Charter were created.

Commissioner Bremby said the HIT Council retains full wherewithal to accept, reject, and modify the Charter. Commissioner Bremby said there was no opportunity to attend the Quality Council meeting on the 16th because he was notified at 2:00pm that the HIT Council Charter was on the Quality Council's agenda for 6:00pm that day. He was then informed of the Quality Council's requested edits at 10:00pm on the 16th and there wasn't sufficient time to review the edits with the HIT Council before the Steering Committee meeting on the 17th. Additionally, no other Council is required to include a "Guiding Principles" section in their Charters.

Ms. Moratti reviewed the redlined version of the HIT Charter. Mr. Raymond commented on the intent of items two and three under "Quality," stating the importance of understanding the specifics of what the QC is asking in terms of measurement. Ms. Moratti remarked that the QC interpreted these items as giving the HIT Council vetoing power, and suggested the language be revised to clearly articulate the collaborative nature of the HIT Council's work in regards to the QC measures. Sheryl Turney said of highest importance is what is measured and what data is going to be required. Without the data, the HIT Council is unable to effectively complete a large part of its work. Anthony Dias suggested item number five in the "Quality" section of the HIT Charter come before item number four. Dr. Checko agreed that the issue is one of language and that the HIT Council is speaking in terms of data and variables. She suggested the Council give clarity around the fact that these items are data driven requirements as opposed to anything suggesting possession. Additionally, Dr. Checko agreed with Dr. Dias, stating that item number five under "Quality" is not a standalone item. Perhaps this could be clarified with sub items, a, b, and c under that component. Amanda Skinner said she agrees with adding language that speaks to the collaborative nature of inter-Council work. However, Ms. Skinner said this collaboration must be mutual, as some requests may be unfeasible, and part of the HIT Council's job is to provide expertise to determine what is achievable. Matt Katz agreed with Dr. Dias, and suggested reversing the order of number four and five, and inserting the word data before attribution and said it was critical these items not be deleted from the Charter. Mr. Miller agreed with Matt Katz that number two and three should not be deleted from the Charter because they are needed to define requirements. Michael Hunt asked for clarification regarding the QC's elimination of the term "attribution." Ms. Moratti said that the QC interpreted attribution to mean the manner in which populations are attributed, and not the manner in which we attribute data, as the HIT Council intended. Dr. Tikoo suggested the word attribution be kept to satisfy the requirement for value based payment of attributing patients to plans and providers and implementing these algorithms. Mr. Miller said the HIT Council owns implementation of data attribution. Dr. Dias said items four and fourteen are redundant and suggested they be merged. Dr. Checko disagreed, stating they weren't entirely the same. Ms. Moratti suggested further contemplation by the Council. Mr. Katz recommended a redline draft including the council members' discussion be circulated to Council members. Ms. Skinner asked if revisions could be handled by email to eliminate the need for a lengthy discussion at the next meeting. Commissioner Bremby said it was okay for the group to process offline but they could not approve changes without a public meeting. Dr. Checko asked if a special meeting could be scheduled to allow the HIT Council's approval of the Charter prior to the HISC meeting, where the Charter will be re-reviewed for possible approval. Ms. Moratti said the PMO will work to reestablish a redline version and refine the Charter to incorporate the Council's point of view and determine the manner in which the Council will complete the final approval. Dr. Tikoo asked if other Charters will reflect guiding principles and reflect collaboration with other workgroups. Mr. Katz agreed with Dr. Tikoo, stating that it is unclear The HIT Council is the only group being asked for

guiding principles. He said he was not comfortable adding sections to the HIT Council Charter that aren't in other work group Charters. Ms. Skinner said the purpose of the HIT Council is different than other Councils. The HIT Council is at the service of the other Councils, to support them in the realization of their objectives. Dr. Checko suggested, that collaboration should be in all Charters. Dr. Checko asked why the HIT Council can't sit down with the Quality Council, and said there has to be a process for collaboration. Additionally, Dr. Checko suggested an item addressing the data solution's governance be added under scope. Ms. Turney agreed with Dr. Checko and Ms. Skinner, suggesting the HIT Charter have more collaborative language. She also commented that requirements from other work groups need to be more specific and that something more robust was needed in the Charter language. Victor Villagra agreed that language addressing collaboration of the Work Groups is critical. Dr. Villagra said he would assume this would be across all work groups given interdependencies. Mr. Katz said interdependency was important. Commissioner Bremby said there are governance issues and a granularity of engagement is needed. Also, that the HIT Council needs to think about the timing of its meetings relative to the Steering Committee meetings to handle issues that will come up. Commissioner Bremby suggested the Charter continue to be evolved off-line and that he would explore the convening of a special meeting to adopt the changes. There may be items, such as the guiding principles, that fall out of the Charter. The Council agreed.

Ms. Moratti reviewed consumer advocate concerns and other comments that surfaced during the September 17th HISC meeting. To address feedback from the HISC, Ms. Moratti reviewed the rationale for the selection of Zato for the Short Term Solution Pilot, available in the meeting presentation, [here](#). Ms. Skinner said she was wrestling with what it means to be a short term solution and questioned the advantages. Phillip Renda suggested the Council agree on definition of Short Term. Often a Short Term Solution is thought of as a "throw away" but in this case it may mean what is doable in the timing we have. There's a very tight timeframe. Dr. Checko said her recollection was that the Council reviewed the APCD and Zato solutions. APCD could not meet some of the proposed measures. She said the Council asked for a demo. Mr. Raymond said there were some historical points to remember. The short term solution was also considered in order to identify flaws in the model. There was a small test set, which isn't a good approach to prove a solution. Mr. Raymond said the Zato solution represented ready access to technology as they await final recommendations from the Quality Council, that they can't be sure what sources will be needed until then. Mr. Raymond disagreed with Mr. Renda in that the Short Term Solution might very well be a "throw away" solution depending on the work of the Quality Council and that is the point of innovation, to try multiple avenues. Ms. Skinner recommended the short term solution be referred to as a pilot, and was assured it was. Ms. Moratti said the concerns that were raised were about the process to select Zato for a pilot and that there may be some perception of advantage for the long term solution. She reminded the Council of the rationale it used and the need for better communication around the process. Mr. Miller remarked that the decision came about as a means to leverage what currently exists in the state to see if it works for our environment, that this isn't about one technology solution being better than another. In regards to the long term solution, Mr. Miller suggested various components could be changed out over time based on viability of components and infrastructure. Ms. Turney commented that the Council could clarify its evaluation process for naysayers.

5. Consumer Concerns

Ms. Moratti reviewed the August 31st letter that eight HISC and Consumer Advisory Board (CAB) members brought forth to Lieutenant Governor Wyman outlining the concerns over process, substance, and timelines of the HIT Council. The letter can be reviewed on the HIT Council website, [here](#). Dr. Villagra said the Council has a communication problem; that issues raised in the letter are perceptions that do not reflect the reality of the Council's process and deliberation. He suggested concerns about transparency should be based on facts and that the Council owes the people that wrote the letter a comprehensive explanation. Dr. Checko added that there is a great deal of confusion about the existing Zato contract and if the contract extends to SIM or if this is an opportunity to utilize Zato for SIM purposes without paying for it. Commissioner Bremby agreed with Dr. Villagra stating that there is a communication challenge. In construction of the HIT plan and budget, the group aimed to leverage the resources and align state infrastructure. Most of the technologies in the grant are existing assets. APCD wasn't an asset the group could use. The existing Zato license with DSS could be leveraged for SIM. Commissioner Bremby pointed to a mass communication issue that puts the HIT Council in a defensive position and asks it to take on things no other group has been asked to do. Regarding the consumer advocates letter's concern that only one vendor was invited to present at HISC, Commissioner Bremby noted that other Work Groups have had presentations by sole vendors that received contracts, an issue that he will take up at the next Steering Committee meeting. Commissioner Bremby went on to say the HIT Council is trying to accomplish an unprecedented feat, with wherewithal, expertise, and talent. He stated that no other state was given a grant for SIM without having a fully developed HIE or APCD and that Connecticut has neither. The SIM evaluators saw something in the Connecticut proposal that merited that bet. Commissioner Bremby said there is a need to look at governance overall. Dr. Villagra suggested the Council release a communication outlining the facts of the decision and distribute a response at the end of next week. Dr. Hunt suggested the communication include the concern that Zato has limited healthcare experience and explain how the Council is prepared to support the tool and where it will live.

6. Design Team Charters, Milestones and Deliverables

Ms. Moratti reviewed the proposed approach for the Technology Pilot Oversight Design Team and the Long Term Solution Design Team. Ms. Turney asked if there would be PMO representation in both groups. Ms. Moratti said the PMO and UConn will be providing staff support for the Design Groups. Mr. Miller recommended the group determine criteria for a successful pilot. Dr. Checko remarked that the Long Term Solution Design Team will need additional end user participation. Perhaps the HIT Council will solicit non-voting representatives from the Practice Transformation Task Force (PTTF) and the QC.

Dr. Dias asked if there is another opportunity to nominate participants to the Design Group. He nominated Ms. Skinner for participation in the Technology Pilot Oversight Design Team. Ms. Turney seconded the nomination. Ms. Skinner said she would contemplate participation and let the Council know at a later date.

Ms. Skinner advised the group to consider Epic's enormous footprint in the state's systems and recommended the pilot test include Epic as it is notoriously difficult to extract data from.

Ms. Moratti reviewed the proposed steps and timeline for the Design Groups, available on our website, [here](#). Mr. Raymond said the question of the level of effort required to test the solution for the broader measure set is a question for this Design Team. Dr. Villagra

suggested exchanging “Zato” for “selected vendor” in the Design Group Charters. Mr. Dias agreed. Ms. Turney suggested the addition of potential risks and obstacles that may impede adoption, and their corresponding mitigation plans. Dr. Villagra asked if the Council should include others in number seven, perhaps the Quality Council. Ms. Skinner suggested item eight in the Technology Pilot Oversight Design Team Charter be modified to ask “in what way” instead of “whether or not” the QC will interact with the Design Teams. Mr. Dias suggested adding criteria to the list. Dr. Checko suggested adding a question about the cost to the end user to participate with the vendor as well as the long-term costs. Dr. Villagra asked if the Council had a public statement for end users, providers that will participate. Ms. Moratti said a significant work will be identifying and securing the level of commitment needed to successfully test. Ms. Turney commented about the need to define a minimum quality measure set and asked who will be defining specifications. She also mentioned private sector efforts. Dr. Dias suggested the October 19th deliverable of the Technology Oversight Pilot Design Team be moved back a week as it will be the heaviest lift in the process.

Ms. Moratti reviewed the Charter of the Long Term Solution Design Team. Dr. Villagra suggested the question of the frequency with which these metrics will be aggregated and reported be added. Ms. Turney suggested the question of identifying the historical data requirements. Dr. Checko suggested adding a reference to the permanence of the data sets. Dr. Tikoo reminded the group that they are not the deciders of data ownership. Data ownership is a bigger SIM discussion for the HISC. Commissioner Bremby suggested the governance question be taken to HISC for guidance.

Ms. Moratti said a doodle poll will be circulated to determine the best meeting time for Group participants.

Dr. Checko moved to approve the concept of the proposed process for the Design Groups. The motion was seconded by Ms. Turney and the motion to move forward in concept with additional modifications was approved.

7. Quality Council Update

Ms. Moratti gave the HIT Council an update on the QC’s progress to date. Ms. Turney asked if the QC had any objectives relating to the important healthcare issue of information blocking; whereby clinicians are blocking the sharing of data between systems. Dr. Tikoo suggested bidirectional feedback be given to the QC defining the blocking of information problem and asking for the QC’s recommendation of a quality metric to address the issue. Commissioner Bremby said the item was new and expressed concern over prescribing work to another Council. Ms. Turney stressed the importance of the matter, especially for the Long Term Solution. Commissioner Bremby asked Ms. Turney to draft a communication on the importance of the issue to HIT Council, and that he would forward this issue to the Steering Committee. Ms. Turney agreed.

Ms. Moratti reviewed the QC implementation plan objectives.

Dr. Checko asked for an update on the creation of the advisory group for the HIE called for by Senate Bill 811. Commissioner Bremby reviewed the current administrative progress of the group, stating that the September meeting was cancelled due to lack of a quorum and delay in appointments. Dr. Checko asked if there were appointments to date. Commissioner

Bremby said there is a list of appointments on the website, which can be circulated to the group.

8. PTF Update on CCIP

Ms. Moratti reviewed the PTF's progress.

9. Next Steps

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

DRAFT