

# HIT Enrollment Workgroup Draft Transcript August 31, 2010

## Presentation

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the Enrollment Workgroup. This is a public call. There will be opportunity at the close of the meeting for the public to make comments. Let me do a quick roll call. Aneesh Chopra will be joining late.  
Sam Karp?

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Paul Egerman?

**Paul Egerman – eScription – CEO**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Cris Ross?

**Cris Ross – LabHub – CIO**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Jim Borland? I know he dialed in. Jessica Shahin?

**Lynn Jordan**

Lynn Jordan for Jessica.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Lynn, thank you. Stacy Dean? Steve Fletcher couldn't make it. Reed Tuckson? Tom Baden? Ronan Rooney or Walt Sezlack? Rob Restuccia? Bob Arndt for Ray Baxter?

**Bob Arndt**

Yes. Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Gopal Khanna? Bill Oakes? Ruth Kennedy? Anne Castro?

**Anne Castro – BlueCross BlueShield South Carolina – Chief Design Architect**

I'm here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Oren Michels could not make it. Wilfried Schobeiri?

**Wilfried Schobeiri – InTake1**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Beth Morrow for Terri Shaw?

**Beth Morrow – The Children’s Partnership – Staff Attorney**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Sallie Milam?

**Sallie Milam – State of West Virginia – Chief Privacy Officer**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Dave Molchany? Elizabeth Royal?

**Elizabeth Royal – SEIU – Political Coordinator**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Bryan Sivak? Kristen Ratcliff?

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

I’m here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Bobbie Wilbur?

**Bobbie Wilbur – Social Interest Solutions – Co-Director**

I’m here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Sharon Parrott?

**Sharon Parrott – Office of the Secretary, Dept. of Health and Human Services**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Nancy DeLew? Gary Glickman? John Galloway? Donna Schmidt? David Hale?

**David Hale – National Institutes of Health, Dept. of Health and Human Services**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Paul Swanenburg?

**Paul Swanenburg – SSA – Senior IT Specialist & Program Manager**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

David Hansell? Julie Rushin? Henry Chao? Tony Guajardo? John Roessler? Did I leave anybody off?

**Jim Borland – SSA – Special Advisor for Health IT, Office of the Commissioner**

Judy, this is Jim Borland. I’m on.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

I’ll turn it over then to Sam.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

Good morning, everyone. This is the sixth Enrollment Workgroup call/meeting and I appreciate everybody on the last day of August being on this call. I'm sorry we're missing a number of people, who had reported being on vacation.

We have really two topics for the call today. One is we wanted to do a very brief update on the presentation that Aneesh and I did yesterday to the Standards Committee. Secondly, we want to update you on what the status of the appendices are and what next steps are in place.

Let me start out by saying that we had a robust conversation yesterday with the Standards Committee. This followed the meeting that we had on August 19<sup>th</sup> with the HIT Policy Committee. The Standards Committee, as you might imagine, was quite engaged in some of the technical and privacy issues that are raised in the recommendations. We presented them with a version of what you were sent this morning and that is the latest version of the recommendations that has a little preamble on the front of it. When we talk about the appendices we'll talk much more about the more detailed set of verbiage that exists to really play out much more of the consumer centric model that we talked about.

Unfortunately, I just stepped out of a meeting and I don't have access to the changes that were recommended by the Standards Committee, so Kristen or Farzad, are you on line and could actually walk people through the two specific line item changes that were recommended?

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

Yes. I can go ahead and do that.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

That would be terrific.

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

If you pull up the document that was sent around there were two changes and this is a clean version, but I can point out exactly where the change was made. The first change was made in recommendation 3.1. The Standards Committee recommended a change in the first sentence of 3.1 so that it would read, ~~“Federal and state agencies should express business rules using a consistent, technology neutral standard format building on the core data elements identified through the NIEM process.”~~

So there was much discussion during the meeting about whether we were recommending one set of standards for the data elements through the NIEM process and then a separate set of standards for the business rules through sort of those examples that were previously in the recommendation, the SBVR and the RIF language formats. The Standards Committee was just concerned that we tie the work being done on standardizing data elements with the work being done on standardizing the expression of business rules, so that was sort of one change that was put in the recommendations to accommodate that request.

Then the second change is in the Privacy and Security section. If you go to page three of the document that you were sent you'll see that prior to recommendation 5.1 we added a small paragraph indicating more explicitly than we had before that these recommendations should be considered in conjunction with and should be implemented consistently with both, the Fair Information Practices and the nationwide privacy and security framework. So we just took this language from the recommendations that the HIT Policy Committee's Privacy and Security Tiger Team presented to the Standards Committee yesterday and sort of plugged it in there just to make sure that we are developing a consistent approach across all of the groups that are working on privacy and security.

Those were really the two changes that they requested. I don't think there's anything else that was changed in the document. You can see we have included the preamble in its kind of current form. It was really a pretty robust discussion yesterday. I thought it was really good. They had good insights and feedback. I know a number of people on the workgroup were actually also on the call so, Sam, if you want to take back over?

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

Cris, anything to add about the change that was made on the business rules section?

**Cris Ross – LabHub – CIO**

I think the change to 3.1 made a lot of sense. I think there were some folks who believed that we should be documenting rules and data using the same standard. That I think was misguided, but where the language ended up, in terms of making sure that the two standards talk to each other, made a lot of sense.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

Any comments from workgroup members about these two changes that we took from the Standards Committee? Okay.

I think the thing that I heard the Committee say was with respect to this language added around consistency of privacy rules was the Standards Committee and the Policy Committee have been talking an awful lot over the last couple of months about new privacy rules. What I heard out of this was this isn't something that we think needs to be much more consistent in just the work that this Workgroup is doing, but it needs to be more consistently expressed across all of the activities of the HIT Policy and Standards work.

Farzad, are you there to talk about the status of the appendices?

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

He's actually not on the phone. I think he had a conflict, but I can talk about the appendices. So, I think what we're doing today is sort of taking another final stab at revising all six of the appendices and then the plan is to get them out to you guys tonight. It's going to be kind of a quick turnaround, but we want you to have a chance to review the appendices in their existing format.

So the plan will be to get all of the appendices out tonight to the Workgroup and to request any revisions or changes by COB tomorrow. Then at that point it was decided that since the appendices will be attached with the recommendations and coming out under the auspices of the Policy and Standards group, that we should circulate the appendices also to those two groups, so as soon as we receive your revisions and feedback tomorrow, we will send out for revisions and feedback to both, the Policy and Standards Committee and hope to receive those to have a final draft of the appendices by Friday COB.

**W**

So are we going to get all of the appendices or just the appendix for our groups?

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

That might be something that's up for discussion. I think it might be good if everyone saw the appendices and could put them in context with the others.

**W**

Yes. I would like to see them all actually.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

We could say that with the exception of the consumer, Appendix A, most of the appendices are one, no more than two pages, so it's not a huge document to read. We spent a tremendous amount of time and Kristen should be given a lot of credit for going through and doing a major editing and trying to create a single document that speaks in a single voice from the Workgroup. So I think you'll find an easy read with these appendices.

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

Yes. So we will get those finished up today and get those out to the entire group tonight by COB.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

Kristen, did you want to talk about what the next steps are beyond the finalization of the recommendation document, which will be the preamble, the recommendations and the appendices?

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

Sure. So we will be beginning, now that the recommendations have been approved by both the Standards and Policy Committees, beginning the internal review process today. We'll be circulating the recommendations for review and comment to key stakeholders within HHS. Then it will go through further review process and we hope—not we hope—we plan we will have the final set of recommendations and appendices published in some form or fashion by September 17<sup>th</sup>, which is sort of the drop dead deadline.

**W**

Are these going to go in the Federal Register?

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

There is still discussion. I don't know that there is a consensus on that yet, but I think it's still being considered as a possibility.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

So, I think that concludes the business that we have. We had this call on the calendar. We wanted to give everyone an update on where we are in the process and what the next steps are. Any questions from anyone?

There still is an open question, which we will hope to address in our next call, about what the ongoing role of the Workgroup will be. This is an issue we're going to take up with staff. Clearly, one of the issues that is going to be ongoing is the completion of the NIEM work that Doug Fridsma and his team have been doing. They have now preliminary recommendations on I think at least six of ten standardized data elements. They still have some more work to do on that, so that's one area and I suspect that there will be others, but we'll have some clarity about that in our next call.

Any other questions from Workgroup members?

**Cris Ross – LabHub – CIO**

I think one of the issues we also need to address is the investigation of rules sort of parallel to the NIEM process for data. That came up in the Standards Committee, who actually is going to do that work to begin to generate those rules. Yes.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

So we will add that to the list. Of course, there's also the issue of this reference model that we propose for the verification service, as well as the reference work that Cris is referring to in the business rules. We will have some more clarity about that in the next call.

If there isn't anything else, let me thank you all for dialing in on the last day of August. Have a good Labor Day weekend. The appendices will go out shortly. Kristen, is that right?

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

Yes.

**Sam Karp – California HealthCare Foundation – Chief Program Officer**

They'll go out shortly and we'd like comments back, using Track Changes, back to Kristen no later than close of business tomorrow. Thank you, everyone.

**Kristen Ratcliff – Office of the National Coordinator**

Yes. Thank you, guys.

**W**

Thank you.