

CC - MONTHLY CALL MEETING NOTES 2 25 11

Coordinating Committee

Monthly Call

Meeting Notes: 2/25/11 (2:00 - 3:00 pm EST)

NOTE: *Portions of the meeting notes related to Confidential Participant Information may have been removed.*

Committee Members (attendance signified with a “✓”)

Participant Members

- ✓ Michael Matthews, MedVirginia (CC Chair)
- ✓ Laura Conn, CDC
- ✓ Stephania Griffin, VA
- ✓ John Mattison, Kaiser Permanente
- ✓ Marc Overhage, Regenstrief
- ✓ Stone Quillian, DoD
- ✓ Kitt Winter, SSA
- Rodney Cain, HealthBridge

Cooperative Representative Members

- ✓ Holt Anderson, NCHICA (CC Vice-Chair)

Definite Plan Member

Jeffrey Blair, LCF Research

ONC

- ✓ Mary Jo Deering
- ✓ Mariann Yeager (CC Secretary)

Invited Subject Matter Experts

- ✓ Steve Gravely, Troutman Sanders
- ✓ Erin Whaley, Troutman Sanders
- ✓ Doug Fridsma, ONC Office of Standards and Interoperability
- Rich Kernan, Specifications Lead, ONC
- Leslie Power, ONC Testing Team

Confirmed Observers

- ✓ Sean Turner, Catholic Healthcare West
- ✓ Melinda Machones, Community Health Information Collaborative
- ✓ Cheryl Stevens, Community Health Information Collaborative
- ✓ Lt. Col. Michael Holmes, DoD
- ✓ Gary Reeder, EHR Doctors
- ✓ Trudy Matthews, HealthBridge
- ✓ Dave Perry, Lovelace Clinic Foundation
- ✓ Nick VanDuyne, New York eHealth Collaborative
- ✓ Kevin Brady, NIST
- ✓ Dennis Reuss, Quality Health Network
- ✓ James Killeen, San Diego Beacon Collaborative
- ✓ Adriane Able, South Carolina Health Information Exchange
- ✓ Marty Prah, SSA
- ✓ Pam Waters, SSA
- ✓ Kate Cauley, Wright State University
- ✓ Samantha Stamper, WVHIN
- ✓ Avinash Shanbhag, ONC
- ✓ Jitin Asnaani, ONC Office of Standards and Interoperability
- ✓ Renee Rowell, ONC Office of Standards and Interoperability
- ✓ Doug Hill, ONC Implementation Team
- ✓ Vijay Shah, ONC Implementation Team
- ✓ Linda Toscano, ONC Implementation Team
- ✓ Amram Ewoo, ONC/Deloitte
- ✓ Benson Chang, ONC/Deloitte
- ✓ Erik Pupo, ONC/Vangent
- ✓ Kate Berry, NeHC
- ✓ Vernetta Roberts, NeHC
- ✓ Meryt McGindley, NeHC
- ✓ Ernest Clover, NeHC

Meeting Summary

Agenda Topic #1: Identify participants

Discussion Summary: Roll call facilitated to identify CC members and observers present.

Decision / Outcome: See list of participants and observers noted above.

Action / Follow Up: N/A

Agenda Topic #2: Quorum

Discussion Summary: Committee Chair confirmed the CC members present and declared a quorum.

Decision / Outcome: Quorum was established since 8 of the voting members, including at least one Federal and one non-Federal Type 1 members, were present.

Action / Follow Up: N/A

Agenda Topic #3: Review Agenda

Discussion Summary: The agenda was reviewed and a request for any new business was made.

Decision / Outcome: No new business was identified.

Action / Follow Up: N/A

Agenda Topic #4: Approve 1/26/11 Meeting Notes

Discussion Summary: Meeting notes from 1/26/11 were reviewed by the CC.

Decision / Outcome: A motion to approve the 1/26/11 meeting notes was made, seconded and approved without further discussion.

Action / Follow Up: Mark meeting notes as final and post to <http://www.hhs.gov/healthit> web site.

Agenda Topic #5: Policy and Technical Task Group Update

Discussion Summary:

- Scope of Testing Issues: The Task Group is continuing to work on additional recommendations related to the scope of testing for applicants and Participants. The Testing Team is preparing a document for the Task Group that will describe options for addressing scope of testing issues. The Task Group will discuss these options at its March 14th meeting and report to the CC at its next meeting.
- Materiality of Revised Specifications
 - Authorization Framework, Messaging Platform, and Web Services Registry: At its last meeting, the CC asked the Task Group to review changes to these three specifications and make a recommendation on whether these changes are "Material" as defined in the DURSA. The Task Group has reviewed the specification changes along with the results of the materiality survey that was sent to the Participants. While the Task Group does not think that the changes will be Material, they are not prepared to make a recommendation until a migration plan is developed. The migration plan is critical because all of the Participants will need to migrate to the new specifications at the same time to avoid breaking interoperability among Participants. The Task Group recommended that a 6 month migration plan be developed and that the Spec Factory consider revising the changed specifications so that they will be backwards compatible. The Spec Factory is developing a migration plan and expects to have a draft for the Task Group to review in March 2011. At that time, the Task Group will review the changes in conjunction with the migration plan and make a recommendation on materiality.
The CC discussed whether a 6 month migration is too long given the importance of the changes in the specifications. While it was acknowledged that some of the changes in the specifications do not actually fix the known issues, the CC still felt it was important to evaluate the benefits and risks of a shorter migration.
 - Query, Retrieve, Patient Discovery, Document Submission, PQRS: The Technical Committee is asking the CC to evaluate changes in these five specifications to determine whether they are Material. These specification changes were either approved by the Technical Committee during its February 1st meeting or will be approved by the Technical Committee during its February 28th meeting.
- Empty CCD Issue: The Task Group is continuing to discuss this issue and determine whether there are any circumstances in which it would be appropriate for a Participant to return an "empty CCD." The Task Group will present its recommendation to the CC during the CC's March 23rd meeting. There is a general recognition that this issue may have broader impact and require input from a larger group of stakeholders. At this point, however, there is not a single established mechanism for seeking this input. As a result, the CC expects that the Task Group's recommendation will include a recommendation that a broader audience be engaged on this issue, if the Task Group believes that would be appropriate. At that point, the CC will work with ONC to determine how to obtain this broader input.
- Web Service Registry Issue: During an Operating Policy & Procedure Task Group meeting, a question was raised about how Participants use the web services registry. Currently, all Participants are required to comply with the web services registry specification. The specification, however, does not describe how the Participants will actually use the web services registry in transactions with other Participants. The OP&P Task Group brought this issue to the attention of the CC and the CC asked the Policy & Technical Task Group to review the issue and make a recommendation about whether any additional policies and procedures should be adopted regarding use of the web services registry in transactions.

Decision / Outcome - Summary:

A motion to ask the Policy & Technical Task Group to analyze the risks and benefits of accelerating the migration process was made, seconded and approved.

A motion was made to ask staff to distribute a materiality survey to the Participants for the 5 specifications that are being changed and for the Policy and Technical Task Group to evaluate the results of the survey and make a recommendation on materiality to the CC. This motion was conditioned on the Technical Committee approving the changes to the specifications at its February 28th meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

A motion to ask the Policy & Technical Task Group to make a recommendation about whether any additional policies and procedures should be adopted regarding use of the web services registry in transactions was made, seconded and approved.

Action / Follow Up: Staff will communicate all CC decisions to the Policy & Technical Task Group.

Agenda Topic # 6: Operating Policy and Procedure Task Group Update

Discussion Summary: The OP&P Task Group met on February 15th to consider revisions to the Application for Participation and two OP&Ps. The revisions were based on recommendations stemming from the Operations Tiger Team meeting in November 2010. The OP&P Task Group brought forward its recommendations on the Application and OP&P 1 for the CC's review. It will bring forward recommendations on OP&P 3 (the service change process) at a future CC meeting.

The CC reviewed changes to the Application including the following:

- ✓ Removed the notarization requirement: Having the application notarized makes it hard for the Applicant to revise incorrect information because the Applicant has to have it notarized again. The only benefit of notarization is having confirmation of the identity of the person signing the document. The Operations Tiger Team and OP&P Task Group believe that the burdens outweigh the benefits so they are recommending this requirement be removed.
- ✓ Removed the Certificate of Good Standing requirement: The submission of applications is being delayed because of the requirement that Applicants submit a Certificate of Good Standing. In some states, it takes weeks to obtain this. Instead, the Operations Tiger Team and OP&P Task Group are recommending that Applicants attest that they are a valid legal entity in good standing. This is the first bullet in Part IV of the application.
- ✓ Add a statement about testing: In anticipation of the Policy & Technical Task Group making a recommendation about the scope of Validation Testing, the OP&P Task Group is recommending that a general statement be added to Part III of the Application that sets forth the expectation that the Applicant has conducted a review of its system and it knows which components to test.

The CC also reviewed changes to OP&P 1. All of the revisions in OP&P 1 have previously been endorsed by the CC with the exception of the change on page 5 under (a) Acceptance. These changes were never approved by the Participants, however, because the approval process was put on hold pending recommendations from the Operations Tiger Team. The change on page 5 is based on a recommendation from the Operations Tiger Team to improve the work flow for executing the DURSA. Basically, the Chair will execute the DURSA no more than 30 days before an Applicant is scheduled to go live. This will give the applicant time to obtain and implement its certificate.

Decision / Outcome: A motion to accept the changes to the application was made, seconded and approved. A motion to accept the changes to OP&P 1 and ask staff to survey the Participants to obtain their approval of the changes was made, seconded and approved.

Action / Follow Up: The Onboarding Team can begin using the revised application. Staff will circulate to all Participants a survey seeking their approval of the changes to OP&P 1.

Agenda Topic #7: Update on February 8th Exchange Visioning Session

Discussion Summary: Mariann Yeager summarized the key findings from the February 8th Visioning Session. One of the most important results of the Visioning Session was that ONC agreed to lead an effort to enhance and develop robust testing capabilities for the Exchange. Avinash Shanbhag from ONC is on point for this effort. He provided an update to the CC on the progress that has been made on this initiative to date. ONC and NIST had a productive meeting to discuss testing capabilities. There is strong agreement that the testing capabilities can be enhanced to make them more scalable. ONC has undertaken planning activities for this initiative and will work with the Policy & Technical Task Group to get their feedback as ONC develops more definitive plans and solutions.

Decision / Outcome: N/A

Action / Follow Up: N/A

Agenda Topic #8: New Business

Discussion Summary: N/A

Decision / Outcome: N/A

Action / Follow Up: N/A

Agenda Topic #9: Meeting Schedule

Discussion Summary: N/A

Decision / Outcome:

- Next monthly call: 3/23/11, 2:00 - 3:00 pm
- Anticipated agenda items for next meeting:
 - Approve February 2011 Meeting Notes
 - CC Strategy Session Action Item Updates

Action / Follow Up: N/A

Agenda Topic #10: Adjournment

Discussion Summary: The Chair asked whether there was any other business the CC wanted to address. No other business was raised.

Decision / Outcome: A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and passed without further discussion. The meeting adjourned.

Action / Follow Up: N/A