

Joint Development & Implementation Advisory Workgroup

June 2, 2017

1:00 – 2:00pm ET

Welcome

Michael Flynn, NYS, Co-Chair

Roll Call: Warren Williams (CDC), Jim Holsinger (Envision), Gary Wheeler (DXC), Aaron Bieringer (MN), Michael Flynn (NYS), Judy Merritt (STC), Noam Arzt (HLN), Brittany Ersery (KS), Gerri Yett (Ex-Officio), Bill Brand (PHII)

AIRA Staff: Mary Beth Kurilo, and Maureen Neary

Absent: Steve Murchie (Envision), Therese Hoyle (MI), Belinda Baker (WA), Mandy Harris (NV), and Amanda Branham (AIRA)

The ad-hoc minutes from 5/18 were approved as presented.

- Mary Beth provided an [update on the launch of the address cleansing project](#).
 - AIRA plans to roll out the service through [two informational webinars](#) on June 1st and 8th.
 - AIRA will launch a 3-6-month pilot peer user group to share implementation strategies and to collaborate for problem solving.
 - They would also like to explore how the platform specific user groups can support the implementation of SmartyStreets.
 - AIRA will continue to evaluate the information sent back from SmartyStreets and the site reported data from jurisdictions.
- The workgroup discussed lessons learned as they apply to JDI governance and what this will mean for future JDI projects (please reference slide 5).
 - An address cleansing service is a universal need across the community. This isn't a requirement in the governance but did help build support from the community.
 - The solution was flexible enough to cater to the needs of each jurisdiction.
 - The workgroup's time and effort on behalf of the IIS allows for jurisdictions to spend less time and resources.
 - AIRA was able to meet all the desired evaluation metrics around how much the service improved deliverability and savings for sites in undeliverable addresses.
 - Due to time constraints, AIRA was unable to evaluate the metrics on bringing that data back into the IIS.
 - This will be heavily informed by the consolidating records work that MIROW is currently working on.
 - Long term, it would be good to get metrics on improvements on other processes like deduplication.
 - The workgroup did due diligence in researching options, examining the tradeoffs and moving very methodically.
 - The ad-hoc groups were beneficial in expediting certain parts of the project.
 - The scope definitions were clearly defined from the beginning.
 - For future projects, the workgroup should have potential evaluation metrics upfront.
 - Amid the exploration and pilot, communication to the broader community could have been better.

minutes

- The workgroup should define the responsibilities of being an advisory workgroup liaison and carry information back and make sure that each organization is up to speed.

JDI Scoring Tool

Bill Brand, PHII, Co-chair

- As the co-chairs evaluated the scores for the next JDI project the results brought up a few questions about the scoring process.
 - For non-scoring, if any of the proposals received a “no” it would not be considered for a JDI project.
 - All projects received some “no” responses in the non-scoring.
- The workgroup discussed potential ways to improve the scoring process.
 - Some of the questions were complex and did not allow for a variant answer.
 - The scopes did not provide enough information to make such a firm decision.
 - There is a challenge in trying to quantify something that is qualitative.
 - A question should be included that asks about the priority of the project.
 - Clarification around the end result being a tool or guidance should be added because the associated risks will be different for each.
 - There may need to be more work on AIRA’s or small group part to better define each of the scopes.
- The JDI definition has evolved somewhat overtime, but is broad in its definition.
 - It includes collaborative development and implementation of a wide range of artifacts.
 - The workgroup will revisit the definition to see if it requires any updates.
 - There isn’t much distinction between JDI and other groups because of the broad definition.
 - Michael Flynn mentioned that revisiting PHII’s document [Practical guidance for collaborative IIS projects](#) provided him with some clarity around the purpose of the workgroup and JDI in general.
 - The workgroup is charged with creating the governance and help with the oversight and planning efforts around JDI across the community.
 - Projects are the methods in which the group has chosen to get there.

Scoring Results: The Next Project

Michael Flynn, NYS, Co-Chair

Bill Brand, PHII, Co-Chair

Mary Beth Kurilo, AIRA

All

- The projects were ranked qualitatively and the highest scoring project was patient matching and guidance/tool. However, because all three projects had basic criteria questions that were not met for many of the scorers (primarily related to expectations of participation/engagement in the project), the workgroup discussed that it was likely the Project Summaries needed more detail fleshed out before a firm decision could be made.
- **Decision made:** The workgroup agreed to drop data entry (the lowest scoring project) and to further develop the three remaining project scopes for further discussion around which project is the highest priority.
- **Action Item:** Mary Beth and Maureen will begin the process to further develop the scopes for the 3 highest scoring projects.
 - Noam Arzt, Bill Brand and Judy Merritt volunteered to help develop the scopes.
 - The updated scopes will be sent out prior to the July meeting and will be discussed rather than going through the scoring process once more.
- If anyone has any thoughts on how to improve the scoring process, please contact [Mary Beth Kurilo](#).

minutes

Wrap Up

Bill Brand, PHII, Co-Chair

Action Item: AIRA will capture the lessons learned from the address cleansing project in the June minutes and will also document them in a way that can be referenced for future projects.

Bill Brand thanked everyone for their participation and the meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting: July 7th at 1pm ET