

Joint Development & Implementation Advisory Workgroup

November 3, 2017

1:00 – 2:00pm ET

Welcome

Michael Flynn, NYSIS,
Co-Chair

Roll Call: Michael Flynn (NYS), Gary Wheeler (DXC), Aaron Bieringer (MN), Noam Arzt (HLN), Steve Murchie (Envision), Josh Hull (MCIR), Michelle Barber, Matthew Bobo (AK), Warren Williams (CDC),

AIRA Staff: Rebecca Coyle, Mary Beth Kurilo, Maureen Neary, Nathan Bunker, Brittany Gyer

Absent: Mandy Harris (Nevada), Bill Brand (PHIL), Therese Hoyle (MI), Brittany Ersery (KS), Gerri Yett (Ex-Officio), Judy Merritt (STC)

The October minutes were approved as presented.

Project Selection Process

Mary Beth Kurilo, AIRA

- Lessons learned from the current project selection process:
 - Cast a wider net to ensure community input/buy-in.
 - The group needs to have adequate depth of information to make an informed decision.
 - The current scoring process may be too quantitative.
 - Speeding things up would be beneficial.
- A 3-step process was proposed in hopes that a project selection could occur in 3 months or less.
 - Generate project ideas
 - To cast a wide net, gather input from the community and JDI Advisory Workgroup members on viable JDI projects.
 - Consider whether projects suggested would meet a current priority or otherwise provide value for more than one IIS or immunization program.
 - Projects that have contingencies and/or funding issues may not be the best fit for JDI.
 - Confirm that the proposed project has the potential to be implemented broadly.
 - Screen projects
 - Affirm initial considerations.
 - Have the JDI Advisory Workgroup evaluate the considerations with a series of yes/no questions.
 - Using polling, narrow the list to 3-4 viable projects that warrant further development leading to project summaries.
 - Select the project
 - AIRA staff and JDI Advisory Workgroup representatives will draft 2-3 page Project Summaries using the template.
 - Areas of emphasis will include standards or guidance to support the project, risks, and expectations from involved groups throughout the project lifecycle.
- This process will be implemented for the next JDI project selection in spring/summer 2018.
- Committee members had positive reactions to the proposed 3-step process.

minutes

Project #1 – Smarty Streets Roll-Out

Maureen Neary, AIRA

- 11 jurisdictions are enrolled in address cleansing.
 - Oregon and Michigan have reported back favorable results.
- 30 other jurisdictions have expressed interest, 2 more since the last update.
- Goals:
 - 15 IIS enrolled in address cleansing by 10/1/17
 - 24 IIS enrolled in address cleansing by 12/31/17
 - 32 IIS enrolled in address cleansing by 3/1/18
- Project Updates:
 - AIRA's October Monthly Update includes an article about SmartyStreets.
 - Two jurisdictions are talking through Partner Agreement questions with AIRA.
 - The user group has changed to a monthly meeting format.
 - As requested, STC and DXC vendor representatives have been added to the user group.
 - Planning stages for part three of this project – bringing data back into the system, are in progress.
- There is lag time between a jurisdiction expressing interest in the service and getting themselves connected.
 - Moving forward with part three of the project may help jurisdictions gain momentum.
- Even though the first goal wasn't met, it was a good investment for the access.
 - The user group has continued to increase in number.
- It was suggested to present on SmartyStreets and successful implementations of the service at the NIC in May 2018.
- It was also suggested to consider lessons learned from SmartyStreets and similar issues that could occur when selecting the next project in the future.
 - These lessons learned were captured in the pilot findings.

Project #2 – DQA Tool

Mary Beth Kurilo, AIRA
Nathan Bunker, AIRA
Josh Hull, MCIR

- The JDI DQA Governance Group is comprised of JDI representatives and the JDI DQA Technical Team.
 - The group's purpose is to develop the tool technically for release and decide how to manage the surrounding documentation and governance.
 - A coordinator contracted with AIRA will be assisting with this work.
 - The JDI DQA Technical Team will be focused on sharing decisions made and work done to date, integrating community input, helping with test cases and crafting governance for technical elements.
 - The JDI representatives will be focused on managing community input, communicating important information to the community, securing resources, and creating governance and a template for similar projects.
- The JDI DQA Governance Group's main tasks include confirming the community's requirements, updating the DQA tool and developing a plan for ongoing community support.
- Anticipated strengths going into this project include an invested team, a new perspective from Michelle Barber, technical writer, and previous informatic knowledge.
- Anticipated challenges are a short timeline, creating governance around an open source tool being a new territory, and limited technical and financial resources.
- It is a risk we'll have to navigate that those who submit changes may not be willing to put in the effort, and those who put in the effort may not have the community's requirements as priority.

minutes

- Currently, the needs among the community are congruent.
- The tool will be able to be implemented to serve varying situations.
- The group should anticipate differences in need may arise and have set guidelines to address the situation if it occurs.
- Those who are submitting requests have also been willing to put in the effort to make those changes.
 - These participants are given the stronger say since they are driving the project development.
- Josh Hull presented how MCIR has implemented the DQA Tool Project.
 - The DQA Tool timeline for MCIR is as follows:
 - In 2012, DQA Tool HL7 edit checks were implemented for incoming messages.
 - In 2013, The DQA Tool report for onboarding staff was released.
 - From 2014-2015 the report was enhanced.
 - In 2016, the HL7 viewer was developed and released to the onboarding team and regional staff.
 - In 2017 the HL7 viewer was released to providers.
 - The technical architecture is as follows:
 - Messages are received, entered into a database, and processed.
 - As a separate batch process, the messages are pulled out of the database and placed into files.
 - The DQA Tool creates an HTML report for each provider that is stored on their server and is accessible through MCIR.
 - The report contains sections for completeness, quality, and codes received.
 - Staff follows up with providers when a report shows an unrecognized status was received to improve data quality.
 - Every provider has access to the HL7 Message Viewer.
 - The Message Viewer displays a calendar view with gradient color coding showing the quantity of messages received.
 - Individual message information including registry specific statistics, response and errors can also be viewed.
 - MCIR uses a DQA Tool library to map NDC codes to CVX.
 - Nathan Bunker is currently working on a DQA Tool code base that will be able to be leveraged with the library that was written to read in the code base.
 - A new DQA Tool component to build ACKs is being developed.
 - MCIR's ACK's are not 100% compliant but improvement is being made through one of the DQA libraries, DQA Tool HL7 Utilities, which offers an ACK builder.
 - In the original DQA Tool, edits are expressed deep within the code.
 - One of the goals for the new code is to make it easier and understandable in order to make edits.
 - The tool has a standard model for immunization.
 - All data concepts within the immunization field are supported and the importance of different validation issues can be turned on/off through a local site.
 - Each IIS can edit the report template choose what it would like to display.

minutes

- Does the message validation process built into the tool align with the production validation method used by the IIS?
 - The DQA Tool can be configured to have a different error levels for things but there may not be 100% congruence.
 - MCIR's production validation is not connected to the DQA Tool.
 - The DQA Tool does do the validation, but depending how it is implemented the errors could or could not be sent back to the submitter.
- Current development and future of the DQA Tool
 - Community input will be requested to help determine the future development and implementation of the DQA Tool.
- Discussion items around the DQA Tool development:
 - How should what the DQA Tool is doing currently be documented?
 - How should the DQA Tool be scoped for its initial release?
- **Action Item:** This topic will be further discussed on the next call.
- **Action Item:** The JDI DQA Governance Group will also continue to discuss this topic and report back to the JDI Advisory Workgroup.

Wrap Up

Michael Flynn, NYSIIS,
Co-Chair

Michael Flynn thanked everyone for their participation and the meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting: December 1st at 1pm ET