
Digital Tools in Support of Contact Tracing | Apple and Google API Pilot Workgroup

Workgroup Meeting #2: Summary

June 26, 2020

Meeting Goals and Objectives

By the end of the meeting, participants

- Acknowledged the limited scope of the initiative's first white paper
- Identified and consented on final white paper revisions
- Listed topics or issues for future white paper work

Agenda

Item	Time
I. Welcome and agenda	3:00 PM
II. High level revision summary and focal finalizing issues	3:05 PM
III. Discussion and resolution of white paper content A. Nomenclature ("A G ENF" and "Pilot") B. Fundamental considerations C. Learning expectations	3:10 PM
IV. List future white paper topics	remaining
V. Conclude meeting	4:00 PM

Welcome

PHII pieced together and resolved contributions to the white paper from the workgroup. The main goal is to discuss the final round of edits and get to a publication date (June 30). Health officials and state leaders need to see this information, because it is critical to give people a source of guidance.

Summary of actions from previous meeting

- Realized not ready to lay out pilot guidance because there are too many details and resource considerations. This white paper will offer practical perspectives on the learnings as we go on with early pilots
- Staff made deep revisions and shared comments informed by discussion
- Want to make friendly amendments—don't want to make radical changes.

High-level Revision Summary

- Changed the purpose statement and made amendments around the content
- Reorganized into these buckets:
 - Provide executive description
 - Share fundamental public health considerations
 - Include ideas on how to optimize pilot learning

Six major categories for changes:

1. Changed name to “exposure notification framework” instead of “API”
2. Minimized background information to streamline commentary
3. Focused technology description
4. Focused the guidance section on a narrative that would help the reader make a decision on piloting
5. Refocused the pilot discussion on learning—talked about purpose of pilots, agile methodologies and communities of practice
6. Created a list of possible future white paper topics

Suggestion→ Add a caveat that PHII is only funded through this first month—don't want to over-promise we will do these other things. Instead, use this first white paper as enthusiasm for would-be funders

Discussion and resolution of white paper content

- **Nomenclature (A|G ENF and Pilot)**
 - Changing the term “API” to “exposure notification framework (ENF)”
 - ENF is more descriptive and from the high-level nature of the paper, framework is a nice title for it
 - Even technology focuses just on the API, and system could be misinterpreted as a state's system. Framework includes interrelated interoperable systems
 - **Question**→ Should there be an explanation on why only focusing on the AG ENF?
 - The Apple|Google technology is really the only one. Other options can't be used with draining battery.

- There are two competing approaches to that methodology: Harvard MIT and University of Washington Paul Allen method—they're both compromising and re-configuring to Apple and Google's technology.
- North Dakota had a developer that built on Apple and Google and when they came together for this new framework, ND started working with them. Their developer is really excited about building on this platform and being the name source for ND and SD.
- The use of the term pilot—started using this term as if everyone had the same understanding of the meaning. It is likely that people are equivocating on what's meant by pilot. In the paper, try to distinguish between resource pilots and agile development.
 - That word is problematic—in certain conversations, “pilot” means certain things.
 - Maintain the importance of evaluation—it's the most important component to indicate, because the fundamental thing we're driving is that the jurisdiction interested in leveraging the app and deploying it needs to be able to evaluate it before wide-spread adoption.
 - If it's called a pilot, it won't be able to get funding from emergency dollars because it's only spent on known and proven technologies.
 - The pilot phases listed in the table have really long timeframes and may not be realistic—important to have, though, because if someone is able to see this is something you can do quickly, it makes it more appealing to roll out and launch.
 - “Developing public health apps” language—since the intended audience of this document is senior health officials, it fuels the fire that a finished app should be done in two weeks. Find a way to integrate minimally viable product—or just something that indicates it's a draft and not complete after two weeks.
 - Maybe include a phase 0 with legal process.
- **Feedback on pilot project lifecycle table**
 - When some move from phase to phase, what are the indicators of success that you should move to the next phase? Are there checkpoints where we can offer useful guidance?
 - That information is important so it could be added as a future paper topic
 - Add language to make it clear that this is just an example assuming things are moving forward sensibly
 - It will be up to each jurisdiction what that criteria are between different phases—could depend heavily on design choices
 - Those things are hard to determine and put into a document like this—from agile development perspective
 - At some point before rolling out a phase, there has to be readiness in public health system to deal with its positive cases—readiness to respond to that is important. Also, there is a need to decide that contact tracing is the appropriate thing to do.
 - There is a difference between exposure notification and contact tracing and that if traditional contact tracing gets overwhelmed, there's an alternative path with the app to relieve the burden on public health.

- Add context around epidemiology response capacity
- **Seven things for health officials to consider when deciding to pilot**
 - Add point to line on capacity that mentions “send key information to those who have been notified.”
 - It may be a bit confusing that there are seven items in the table and then seven considerations for the health official that are similar but not explicitly linked
 - Changed the numbers to bullets

Next steps and closure

- Integrate new edits into the document
- Send a revised version to the group by Monday, June 29
- Prepare for release by Tuesday, June 30 and add to web page