digital bridge

Meeting Minutes
Digital Bridge Interim Governance Body

Meeting Information

Date:	February 26, 2020	**Location:**	1-866-516-9291
Time:	1:00 – 2:00 PM ET	**Meeting Type:**	Virtual
Called By:	Project Management Office	**Facilitator:**	John Lumpkin
Timekeeper:	Charlie Ishikawa	**Note Taker:**	Jelisa Lowe
Attendees:	See attached		

Agenda Items		Presenter	Time Allotted
1	Call to Order and Roll Call	John Lumpkin / Charlie Ishikawa	2 min
2	Agenda Review and Approval	John Lumpkin	3 min
3	Consent Agenda	John Lumpkin	2 min
4	Grants Management Update	CDC Foundation	10 min
5	Draft 2020 Digital Bridge Governance Agenda	John Lumpkin	10 min
6	Charter and Bylaws: Comments and Next Steps	Bob Harmon	10 min
7	Action: Use Case Scoping Methods Workgroup	John Lumpkin	10 min
8	Announcements	Charlie Ishikawa	5 min
9	Adjournment	John Lumpkin	Remaining

Decisions

1	The governance body formally charged and formed the use case scoping workgroup. Motion by Walter Suarez; seconded by Jeff Engel.

New Action Items		Responsible	Due Date
A.	Submit comments and edits on draft 2 of charter and bylaws	Governance Body	March 11, 2020
B.	Form scoping methods workgroup		

Other Notes & Information

1. **Call to Order** – Quorum was met.
2. **Agenda Review and Approval** – Agenda reviewed; no additions or abstentions.
3. **Consent Agenda** (*John Lumpkin*) –
    A. 2020 In-Person Governance Body Meeting Summary: no discussion; moved as approved.
4. **Grants Management Update** *(Brandon Talley, CDC Foundation)* –
    A. First I want to say a huge thanks to PHII for their support and leadership of Digital Bridge. I'm excited to report Illinois Public Health Institute has been selected to serve as the secretariat with a 12-month grant. We're in the process of finalizing, but it should be underway within the next week or so.
5. **Draft 2020 Digital Bridge Governance Agenda** *(John Lumpkin)* –
    A. We have two main lines of work to enhance governance and begin work on the next use case: is the timing right and are we setting priorities in how the timeline is set up. Is there something we missed in setting up the timeline? The timeline is set up for how we see the workflow going for the coming year, and part of this will be a later discussion item on establishing the process we'll be going through for the use cases, the toll gates we want to set up and how to scope each of those.

       (John Lumpkin reviews items in the timeline. See slide "2020 Digital Bridge Schedule" in meeting products).

       The questions for this particular item are, is the timing right, do we have the right priorities for the activities, and is there something we overlooked on things we will be doing in the coming year?
    B. **Discussion:**
       * **Michael Iademarco:** At the [in-person] meeting, there was a sign-up for each workgroup. Have we see who's on each group to make sure the composition is right? The reason I raise that is because another step in the process is to figure out the bandwidth to move forward with these items. If it's a free-for-all based on whoever signed up and all the use cases are moving forward at the same time, there could be gaps or collisions along the way.
       * **John Lumpkin:** Thank you for raising that. We were looking for people to sign up and consider if there is a better person at their organization who could participate to help balance that bandwidth.
       * **Walter Suarez:** Between now and April, is there any activity the workgroups will be doing themselves or are we focusing primarily on the charter?
       * **John Lumpkin:** Between now and April, we will be establishing the scoping workgroup to frame out deliverables for the use case workgroup.
       * **Walter Suarez:** Walter: I didn't see the timeline for the white paper.
       * **John Lumpkin:** If you look at the graphic, the scoping workgroup will finish in April, and the national public health API is listed there.
       * **Walter Suarez:** Looks like the white paper is intended to be completed before workgroups begin work.
       * **Charlie Ishikawa:** The idea is to charge and form the workgroups and then initiate the work. Over the next month, a proposal could be presented to you on what the workgroup will be working on and then begin work.

- **John Lumpkin:** If there are no additional comments or questions—I don't think we need a motion on this because it's just plotting out our work for the remainder of the year—we can move on to the next agenda item.

6. **Charter and Bylaws: Comments and Next Steps** *(Bob Harmon)* **–**

   A. You can see some of the timeline of what we've been going through. We have a workgroup that has been working on the charter, and we shared that version with the governance body during the in-person meeting. There, they endorsed the guidelines and commented on draft 1. That feedback went back to the workgroup, and we came up with a draft 2. Our next work will be to come back with final comments and adopt it in the April meeting.

      There were some minor, intermediate and major changes. We removed the history to shorten the document and did some internal referencing to make it easier to follow. We proposed an executive committee—subject to review by the collaborative body—and that was strengthened so that the collaborative body can override decisions made by the executive committee. Collaborative body meetings will be quarterly with annual in-person meetings. Other changes include: adopted new standing rules, improved transparency, allowed some opting out of being a voting member and reference to representation.

      (Bob Harmon reviews slide with table that includes major issues and feedback and solutions for each. See slide titled "Major Issues with C&B Draft1* and Solutions Drawn in Draft 2")

   B. **Discussion:**
      - **Michael Iademarco:** I'm curious—in the version history—about what underlies the rationale for voting and nonvoting and what defines it? It seems to me like an organization decides if they're voting or not voting, and we're accommodating people.
      - **Bob Harmon:** Some governance body members were nonvoting.
      - **Andy Wiesenthal:** I was nonvoting—I think it was an informal understanding that people representing the three communities were voting members, and others who had a role in managing the work but were not included in those groups were ex officio.
      - **Michael Iademarco:** Is there a 1:1 correspondence between ex officio and non-voting?
      - **Andy Wiesenthal:** I think so.
      - **John Lumpkin:** I think we're using that term, ex officio, which means someone in that position because of their office. By in large, in most parliamentary settings, unless stated otherwise, ex officio members do vote. Andy is describing the original intent was to make sure the three key partners of the bridge were the ones setting policies and there weren't so many individuals outside of those groups who started to vote and one sector started to become overwhelmed by those who were not part of those sectors.
      - **Michael Iademarco:** If there is a new member, is there something in the charter that steers them by criteria to one category or another? Or do we just say, "we're happy to have you as a new member. Do you want to be voting or nonvoting?"
      - **Bob Harmon:** I think it's the latter that's pursuant to the current recommendation.
      - **Michael Iademarco:** My final point is that it's a laissez faire approach, and there is an opportunity to underpin the voting and nonvoting based on rationale of strategic direction.
      - **John Lumpkin:** Let's take that comment and have the workgroup thing about that.
      - **Bob Harmon:** Any other comments?
      - **Walter Suarez**: One comment on voting: on the previous slide [*Major Issues with C&B Draft1* and Solutions Drawn in Draft 2*], I thought I read that all the actions will require a unanimous vote ot a *super* majority. There's no simple majority Is that correct?
      - **Bob Harmon**: I believe that is correct.
      - **Walter Suarez**: Okay, I'm supportive of that. I just wanted to clarify.

- **Charlie Ishikawa**: Walter, you're correct: in draft 2, its either unanimous or super majority within the collaborative body. However, workgroups operate on consensus.
- **Walter Suarez**: So there is no expected voting in workgroups but just consensus and the chair decides if consensus has been reached.
- **Charlie Ishikawa:** That's correct.
- **John Lumpkin:** We can refine that. Alternative approaches can be shared with the executive committee.
- **Bob Harmon:** This is a graphical presentation of the current structure and the proposed structure of the organization chart. *[Next slide]* We're moving from draft 2 to coming up with a final charter and bylaws draft by April.
- **Walter Suarez:** I want to thank Bob and Michael for facilitating this work. The outcome has been exceptional. My appreciation to both of them
- **John Lumpkin**: I would just add that—I appreciate we're doing this in a very deliberate way, because these kinds of documents have a way of enabling an organization to move forward or hold them back.
- **Bob Harmon**: I appreciate Charlie for facilitating comments, draft, etc.

7. **Action: Use Case Scoping Methods Workgroup** *(John Lumpkin)* –
   A. Part of this process is to make sure we have a way to identify—as these use cases are being developed—how to take an idea, process it and get it to a point where we're ready to commit resources to implement it. So, we're looking for approval of the use case scoping workgroup. Everyone should have received an in-depth document that goes over the scope and how it creates the template and conditions for gating work. As workgroups proceed to gain approval, each will pass through the same kind of gate. They will recommend modifications of the charge. We expect the workgroup will do its work and be done by April.

   Motion: Walter Suarez for approval; seconded by Jeff Engel.

8. **Interacting with other initiatives** *(John Lumpkin)* –
   A. This is an opportunity to share ideas. During our January in-person meeting, we heard presentations from a group of ideas that were presented as potential use cases. We were also presented with a list of initiatives that were known at that point for moving data from public health to health care. What do we as Digital Bridge to interact with other initiatives that weren't selected as a use case and how do we want to engage with them and encourage them to take common approaches.

   B. **Discussion:**
   - **Priyanka Surio:** In terms of these initiatives, as we are participating in other initiatives—how do you want use to communicate about that and how we should intercept?
   - **John Lumpkin:** That's what were trying to address. One of the things that—we mostly talked about initiatives at the national level, but can also focus on state-level issues. How, as Digital Bridge, do we interface with someone who says we would like to gain advice from Digital Bridge on how to use the infrastructure it's putting into place?
   - **Priyanka Surio:** I know some of the workgroups were tasked with assessing what initiatives already exist and how we can engage with those to get a sense of what is happening in the field and how we connect with those. Start to bridge some of those connections, collaborations and partnerships by engaging with folks who are leading those initiatives and introduce them to Digital Bridge. Let them know we're here to learn about what they've been working on and take those back into consideration in terms of how to support.
   - **John Lumpkin:** Would this involve an effort by ASTHO to pull together that catalogue of initiatives at the state level?
   - **Priyanka Surio:** Is there anything you're specially thinking about? This topic could mean a lot of things—to what extent? Timeline? Something high-level? We just need to understand the effort.

- **John Lumpkin:** Something to tease out. Other thoughts?
- **Richard Hornaday:** I see two environments in the way we might want to look at this. One would be where we're actively engaging in something—an example would be back when we were engaging with Parkinson's. Parkinson's was directly related to what we were doing, so those things that are directly related is one type of interaction we may want to have. Then there's also the speculative aspect of things—things that have potential of having a collaborative issue. The way you interact with the other group would be different depending on those things. If you're in more of a speculative or strategic initiative, you would want to have more exploratory conversations at the governance level.
- **John Lumpkin:** Thank you. Other thoughts?
- **Bob Harmon:** Were any of the proposed partners appealing not making the final four or five that are worth mentioning?
- **Michael Iademarco**: We presented our work as preliminary, and Adi's team is working to do two things: finalize and get them vetted through the program so they can be deemed accurate, and the second is that this will be a rolling process in his office—at least for CDC-centric endeavors. That list isn't comprehensive. A strategic issue is does Digital Bridge want to do this passively or proactively? To do this well takes bandwidth and competency in policy, communications or partnerships lanes. We just added four more workgroups with more technical work, potentially, when indeed—if this is the priority—we don't have the people participating, or bandwidth, with the necessary complement of expertise to move toward this issue.
- **Vivian Singletary**: I think what you're saying is true. Part of the reason this came up is because there was concern around what do we say to people outside of Digital Bridge. We want Digital Bridge to remain relevant. We need to be proactive so it does stay relevant over the years and we don't become siloed. Maybe this becomes a workgroup that will sustain this scan of activities going on so we can stay connected.
- **Andy Wiesenthal:** Maybe there needs to be a set of criteria that will help us say, "if you want to consider Digital Bridge to execute this project, you can use this architecture and here's how" with a playbook.
- **Art Davidson**: At the tactical level—I'm involved in CODI (Childhood Obesity Data Initiative), and there's an effort to build a tool—the privacy preserving record linkage tool—that will be used for distributed data networks. Could Digital Bridge benefit from this tool? So, how can Digital Bridge benefit from other things and how can that be exposed.
- **John Lumpkin:** My takeaway is that this is an issue for us, and as we're looking at the four use case workgroups and the work on the white paper, we also need to think about how we address these other initiatives and continue to encourage others to use the architecture we developed.
- **Walter Suarez:** Suggestion: maybe devote five minutes at every meeting to hear about these initiatives from everybody who might be aware on an ongoing basis to maintain the scan. HL7 also has a group that brings up a number of public health initiatives. I'll be happy to serve as the liaison by bringing those back to the collaborative body.
- **John Lumpkin:** Thank you. I think we clearly see this as an area for us to work on. We'll continue to work through some of these suggestions.
- **Jim Daniel:** I wanted to add a comment about the immunization project I'm involved with at NCIRD is one of those initiatives. For that project, I would love to be able to get feedback and experience and hear from the wider community that you have in Digital Bridge—I'm very excited about that interaction.
- **John Lumpkin: T**hink through away to do that and present at next meeting

9. **Announcements** *(Charlie Ishikawa)* **–**
   A. One action: form methods scoping workgroup. Remember to let us know if you'd like to join or who from your or would be good to serve.
   B. Submit comments and edits on draft 2 of charter and bylaws in two weeks.
   C. Two meetings on the schedule: April 2 and May 7, both from 12:00 p.m.-1:00 p.m.

10. **Adjourned.**