Agenda

• Call to Order / Roll Call
  ➢ Mitch Kost, Designated Federal Officer (ONC)

• Overview of meeting (5 minutes)

• Review takeaways from homework (5 minutes)

• Continue discussing characteristics for data class prioritization (40 minutes)

• Review topics for next week’s discussion (5 minutes)

• Public comment (5 minutes)
Overview of the Meeting: Topics and Goals

• Confirm consensus on using two sets of criteria for data class progression:
  » “Value” and “Technical”

• Review our current sets of criteria and make any additions

• Discuss how we should select among these criteria to get to a smaller set

• Next week’s homework:
  » Rank order the proposed criteria
  » Apply your criteria to the data class of your choosing to see how many steps it takes to go from “suggested” to USCDI
Take-aways from the Homework

- Is “Value” the appropriate criterion for entry into the process
  » All respondents agreed...but
  » Need more precise definition of value
  » Need to agree upon a hierarchy of value: what, to whom

- Is “Technical” the appropriate criterion for advancement:
  » All respondents agreed...but
  » Value will continue to help drive progress but “technical” will be the gate

- May need other categories in the USCDI process
Value Criteria

• **Value to Patients**
  » Quality Adjusted Life Years
  » Health Outcomes

• **Value to Stakeholders**
  » Broad Use/Applicability to Mass Population
  » Impact on Clinicians (Performing Their Jobs)
  » Impact on Patients (Their Health)
  » High Priority Policy Goals
  » Value to Workflows (Efficiency, Effectiveness)

• **Aggregated Impact**
  » Health Outcomes
  » Cost

• **Demonstrated Value**
Technical Criteria

- Collectability of Data Nationwide
- Standardization of Data Formats
- Clear Definition of Scope of Data Class
- Maturity of Data Class
- Semantic Standards
- Cost of Collection
- Collected within Standard Workflows
- Standards Exist and Are in Production Use
- Data Class and Standards Have Gone Through Testing, Roll-Out Adoption
Next Week

• New homework
  » Rank order prioritization criteria
  » Apply your criteria to a data class
  » Be prepared to discuss additions, priorities, steps in the USCDI process
To make a comment please call:

Dial: 1-877-407-7192

(once connected, press “*1” to speak)

All public comments will be limited to three minutes.

You may enter a comment in the “Public Comment” field below this presentation.

Or, email your public comment to onc-hitac@accelsolutionsllc.com.

Written comments will not be read at this time, but they will be delivered to members of the Task Force and made part of the Public Record.
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U.S. Core Data for Interoperability (USCDI) Charge

- **Overarching Charge:** Review and provide feedback on the U.S. Core Data for Interoperability (USCDI) structure and process.

- **Specific Charge:** Provide recommendations on the following:
  - Mechanisms/approaches to receive stakeholder feedback regarding data class priorities;
  - The proposed categories to which data classes would be promoted and objective characteristics for promotion;
  - How the USCDI would be expanded and by how much; and
  - Any factors associated with the frequency with which it would be published.
Prioritization Criteria

Characteristics of the Data Class

• Important to a high priority domain
• Based on TEP, Standards body type of review, real time consensus e.g. ISA
• Ease of standardization
• Currently being collected
• Mature standards exist
• Standards exist and are in production use
• High value to many domains
• Captured within current workflows
• "Capturability“
• Viewed as a critical need by someone
• Value to future workflows

Characteristics of the Stakeholder

• Provider/Clinician
• Consumer/Individual/Family
• Payer/Insurance
• Regulator
• Contributes to a valued health outcome
• Researcher
• Public health

Characteristics of the Domain

• High volume
• High cost
• High failure rate
• Cuts across other domains/broad applicability

Characteristics of the Subject Population

• High risk
• High utilizers
• Policy Priority

Characteristics of the Data Management Process

• Cost
• Availability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Potential Discussion Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 2018</td>
<td>• Discuss USCDI Task Force charge scope and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28, 2018</td>
<td>• Proposed categories to which data classes would be promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2018</td>
<td>• Mechanisms and approaches to receive stakeholder feedback regarding data classes and elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 2018</td>
<td>• Objective characteristics for data class promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare Draft Recommendations for HITAC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2018</td>
<td>• Draft recommendations shared with HITAC committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued discussion on objective characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28, 2018</td>
<td>• How the USCDI would be expanded and by how much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 2018</td>
<td>• Frequency of USCDI publication and associated factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 2018</td>
<td>• Update and refine recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2018</td>
<td>• Finalize recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2018</td>
<td>• Present recommendations to full HITAC Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference Materials

- Health IT Standards Committee recommendation letter incorporating Standards & Interoperability Task Force recommendations (March 26, 2015)