Meeting Minutes
Digital Bridge Interim Governance Body

Meeting Information

Date:	April 4, 2019	**Location:**	1-866-516-9291
Time:	12:00 – 1:00 PM EST	**Meeting Type:**	Virtual
Called By:	Project Management Office	**Facilitator:**	John Lumpkin
Timekeeper:	Charles Ishikawa	**Note Taker:**	Jelisa Lowe; Piper Hale
Attendees:	See attached		

Agenda Items

		Presenter	Time Allotted
1	Call to Order and Roll Call	John Lumpkin / Charlie Ishikawa	3 min
2	Agenda Review and Approval	John Lumpkin	2 min
3	Consent Agenda	John Lumpkin	5 min
4	Risk Log: eCR Implementation Progress and Transition Management	Laura Conn / Kristen Hagemann / Rob Brown / Jim Jellison	15 min
5	Action: Governance Body Leadership	TBD	30 min
6	Announcements	Charlie Ishikawa	5 min
7	Adjournment	John Lumpkin	Remaining

Decisions

1	The Digital Bridge governance body approves to have John Lumpkin remain chair of the governance body while a workgroup works through the charter and updates it to allow for decision making regarding the chairmanship and other items as needed. Motion by Bill Mac Kenzie (CDC) that was seconded by Walter Suarez (Kaiser-Permanente). Verbal vote taken. Motion passes with unanimous agreement, no abstainers.

New Action Items		Responsible	Due Date
A.	Charge workgroup to review/revise initiative charter	PMO	May 2019

Other Notes & Information

1. **Call to Order** – Quorum was met.
2. **Agenda Review and Approval** – We have some new representatives from the American Medical Association (AMA). We want to welcome them and thank them for working with us. Dr. Lumpkin reviewed the agenda. There were no additions.
3. **Consent Agenda** *(John Lumpkin)* –
   A. Workgroup updates
      - eCR Implementation Taskforce
      - Pilot Participation Workgroup
      - Evaluation Committee
      - Transition Workgroup
      - Legal, Policy and Regulatory Workgroup
   B. Discussion
4. **Risk Log: eCR Implementation Progress and Transition Management** *(Laura Conn, Kirsten Hagemann, Rob Brown, Jim Jellison)* –
   A. **Implementation Timeline** *(Laura Conn):* Houston and Utah are still in production. Respectively, that's going well—both are making tweaks as data is coming in from the health department side. The data coming in on eCR is amazing compared to what's been seen with ELRs, and our evaluation data will hopefully support that note. The timeline shows the order we anticipate the rest of the sites to move into production. Discussions are happening at the end of this week around end-to-end testing in New York and will hopefully complete that activity over the next month. Michigan is implementing at a local health department and has been successfully able to generate an eICR. California is working on how to connect with AIMS, and the California Department of Health (CDPH) is complete and ready to receive case reports. Kansas continues to work with Lawrence Memorial to determine a triggering solution.

   B. **Transition Management** *(Jim Jellison):* As you know, Digital Bridge has been incubating the eCR use case, and that incubation stage is ending and we're preparing for scale-up. That means that the things that the PMO has been doing for eCR need to transition to other partners, primarily the DSI and CDC. We've been meeting regularly over the last few weeks to discuss this transition. Some of the topics discussed relate to the legal agreements. As you know, the DSI team is pursuing adjustments to the legal and contractual framework that was successful in the operating demonstration sites. Issues related to scalability have been identified and are leading to modifications to this approach. Those modifications will inform development of legal and technical onboarding documents. Much of that is on the current website, but as part of transition, the PMO will be working with the DSI team to develop a new website with new and existing materials. When this transition is complete, the eCR guidance will be on the new website, and the Digital Bridge website will be focused on the high-level mission of this collaborative and will maintain a connection between the two. The PMO has been providing project management for eCR demonstration sites in collaboration with the DSI. That work will transition away from the current PMO as the DSI team prepared to support both existing sites and future implementers. All of these changes will take place between now and August 2019.
   C. **Discussion:**
      - **Richard Hornaday:** Is open registration happening before the onboarding of vendors. How does that happen before the others?

- **Jim Jellison:** That detail will be part of the guidance we're developing (legal and technical onboarding). There's thought of building cohorts around implementation partners that have similar technical infrastructures to make it more efficient.
- **Richard Hornaday:** I just wanted to make sure we're not putting the cart before the horse: meaning, we can't have providers onboard until we have onboarding with vendors.
- **Walter Suarez:** It's important to know which public health agencies are onboarding as well. It wouldn't make sense to have a health care provider from North Dakota that is expecting to report to the North Dakota Department of Health if that health department is not yet on the trusted network.
- **Laura Conn:** We put a couple of things into place to support that. One is authoring by all jurisdictions to RCKMS and to ensure the public health agencies' connections to the DSI. They can receive data via ELRs, but we want to validate they can receive. We are putting some of the infrastructure in place from a technical channel standpoint, but we will have to work with that provider and public health agency to make sure they're ready on both sides. As we evolve thinking around content that needs to be included on the new website, it needs to be parallel with the onboarding guide activities. We will not open up registration for onboarding until those things are available.
- **Richard Hornaday:** During the in-person meeting, there was discussion about having all the public health agencies available by the summer. Is that still a plan or is that now a risk?
- **Laura Conn:** That is still the plan, but we will need to work with the public health agencies to ready their surveillance systems. If there is an interim time to render eICRs while they're getting their systems ready to consume, we can work through that.
- **Walter Suarez:** When we say public health agencies, are we talking about exclusively the state agency or are there also local agencies?
- **Laura Conn:** We're working on that as we communicate with the jurisdictions about the rules in RCKMS that the locals are authoring in addition to the state. Delivery of case reports may be to the state but accessed by the local agency, but it could also go directly to the local agency.
- **Lilly Kan:** As you move forward, it'll be beneficial for us to go alongside with you and learn what that experience has been.
- **Walter Suarez:** For the reportability response (RR), we have to comply with data to LA County and to the state, for example, but the state has centralized repositories. We still need to receive a confirmation that we submitted the data and fulfilled the requirement. Would that also be available through this system—receiving the RR from both jurisdictions required to report?
- **Laura Conn:** Yes, what would be identified as the responsible agency you would report to, would be the local health department but could also be at the state level. So if pertussis is reportable to Alameda County Health Department, it would also be routed through the California Department of Public Health.
- **Mary Ann Cooney:** To let everyone know, we have chosen four states for participation in our upcoming learning community, so this onboarding document will be extremely helpful—particular the legal and policy pieces because that's what this community will focus on.

5. **Action: Governance Body Leadership** *(Hilary Heishman)* –
   A. *John Lumpkin reminds the group of his transition away from Governance Body and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and opens up discussion of moving forward. He steps away from the call to ensure an open conversation. Hilary Heishman will be acting chair for the remainder of the call*
   B. **Introduction:** *(Hilary Heishman):* John Lumpkin's departure raises discussion, because the governance charter does not have a clear provision for the chair. As we go through the next months, we'll need to think about how we structure leadership

Bill Mac Kenzie: I'm thankful for what the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and John Lumpkin have brought to Digital Bridge. Reviewing the charter, it's written to state that governance meetings will be convened by a governance chair, and specifies that it's John Lumpkin, which could mean it's a governance chair, who is John Lumpkin, regardless of whether he works for RWJF, or it could be someone who has to work for RWJF, or it could mean a governance chair who began as John Lumpkin but doesn't have to be him forever. So this raises an issue for us. The charter does name a few specific people and organizations, and also mentions electronic case reporting specifically, which was fine in the beginning but may not meet needs going forward. As we experience other changes, like a change in funder, this is the time to have the discussion about these changes. First, our discussion will focus on who will be the chair, and whether John should continue as the chair, and then have a broader discussion about the charter, and from a broad perspective, change the charter to meet future needs.

Hilary Heishman: This is a situation where we could set this up as a motion. So you had some recommendations. Let's ask for a motion and then open a discussion.
- **Bill Mac Kenzie:** Motion to have John Lumpkin, wherever he is, remain as chair until we have an updated charter, which would give us a new way to choose a chair.
- **Walter Suarez:** I second.

C. **Discussion:**
- **Walter Suarez:** It's too bad John left the call, because I would have liked to express immense gratitude to him for his leadership. My question is: would Blue Cross Blue Shield Foundation of North Carolina be joining Digital Bridge so that a person representing an organization that is part of Digital Bridge can be chosen as chair? Does anyone know if they will join?
- **Bill Mac Kenzie:** I've spoken with John about this, and he said as the president of Blue Cross Blue Shield Foundation, he feels he has the ability to take time to do this. I didn't specifically ask if the foundation would join, but he is willing and would be committed to remaining as chair as long as people wanted him as chair.
- **Andy Wiesenthal:** One clarification: John is taking the job at the Blue Cross Blue Shield Foundation, which is a charitable organization established when Blue Cross Blue Shield went live in North Carolina, so it's not a provider, it's a funder.
- **Walter Suarez:** I understand the distinction, but I was wondering if the organization he would be joining—
- **Bill Mac Kenzie:** We don't know that yet.
- **Hilary Heishman:** Would a vote on this motion be contingent on whether the organization would join as a funder? So we can figure that out either way. Is that something we need to know before we decide?
- **Walter Suarez:** No, it's not necessary to know. It would be a departure from what we've seen, which is that individuals on the governance body are engaged because they represent an involved organization. But I have no concerns in this case. I would hope that the Blue Cross Blue Shield Foundation of North Carolina would join.
- **Hilary Heishmn:** Charlie, is there any consideration of what we'd have to do in the process of an individual joining on behalf of their organization?
- **Charlie Ishikawa:** I think we'd have to update the charter. The chair doesn't have to be a member of the initiative or an ex officio of the initiative.
- **Andy Wiesenthal:** I think John's intention is to continue on so there's no disruption, and we can continue to work toward a charter solution.
- **Hilary Heishman:** Yes, and the motion Bill proposed was that he stay chair while we figure this out. And I'll let Bill restate it, but that's still the motion. Any other comments?
- **Bob Harmon:** As ex officio members and CDC leaders, are you eligible to chair something like this, or is that not allowed?

- **Bill Mac Kenzie:** In general, no, it's not desirable for us to lead these bodies, it might be seen as us receiving advice from a specific body, and that would get into federal advisory committee law, so no, but good question.
- **Bob Harmon:** I support this motion.
- **Hilary Heishman:** Bill, please restate the motion.
- **Bill Mac Kenzie:** Move that the Digital Bridge have John Lumpkin remain as the chair of the governance body while a workgroup works through the charter and updates it to allow for decision making regarding the chairmanship and other items as needed.
- **Walter Suarez:** I second that.
- **Hilary Heishman** Let's take a verbal vote. Nays? Abstains?
  (none)

6. **Announcements and Action Items** *(Charlie Ishikawa)*–
   A. **Action Items:**
   - Next meeting will be in May 2nd at noon – 1 PM EST.
   - The PMO will be following up to draw a charge for a workgroup to convene and look at the charter.

7. **Adjourned.**