

Meeting Date	Meeting Time	Location
February 8, 2022	1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Zoom Meeting Recording

Participant Name and Attendance

Committee Members					
Dr. Patricia Checko, Chair	R	Sheryl Turney	R	Lisa Freeman	
Michael Girlamo	R	John Brady		Michael Fields	R
Justin Peng	R	Kun Chen	R		
Supporting Leadership					
Olga Armah, OHS	R	Adrian Texidor, OHS	R	Chris Wyvill, OHS	
Sumit Sajnani, OHS	R	Amy Tibor, OHS	R	Joseph Rus, OHS	R
Other Participants					
Lorie Geryk, WA-APCD	R	Matthew Lavalle	R	Joanna Duncan, Onpoint	R
Dr. Chima Ndumele	R	Monique Cote, Onpoint	R		

R = Attended Remotely, IP = Attended in Person

Agenda

	Topic	Responsible Party	Time
1.	Welcome and Call to Order	Dr. Patricia Checko	1:00 PM

The regularly scheduled meeting of the All-Payer Claims Database Data Release Committee was held on Tuesday, February 8, 2022 by webinar.

Dr. Pat Checko welcomed Committee members and called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. It was determined that a quorum was present.

2. Public Comment Attendees 1:05 PM

There was no public comment.

3. Approval of the November 9th Meeting minutes Attendees 1:10 PM

Dr. Checko requested a motion to approve the APCD Data Release Committee November 9, 2021 meeting minutes. The motion was made by Michael Fields and seconded by Justin Peng. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

4. Presentation by Washington State: APCD Application Process Program Manager

Dr. Checko introduced Lorie Geryk of the Washington State Health Care Authority to present on the Washington State APCD application process.

Highlights of Ms. Geryk's presentation included:

- An overview of the Washington state data release program and data application process.
 - A brief history and background regarding the establishment of the WA-APCD. The program is state mandated and as of 2020 run by the WA healthcare authority. Legislation establishing the WA-APCD was passed in 2014 and data submissions began in 2017.
 - o Data Release and Data Policy Advisory Committees convened.
 - A public facing website was launched in 2018 while simultaneously opening the data release program.



- An overview of the data release language in Washington state statute. Ms. Geryk stated that
 Washington statute identifies categories of data requesters, and each are assigned different levels of
 access to identifiable data. Ms. Geryk provided an overview of each category of data requestors.
- An overview of the five data products available through the WA-APCD. Dr. Checko asked a question
 regarding the format of the Analytic Enclave product. Ms. Geryk noted that the enclave is not public; it
 is application-based and requires a stringent request process. Ms. Armah asked if the enclave
 subscribers download the information from the enclave. Ms. Geryk responded yes, they must request
 permissions through an agreement.
- Ms. Geryck also provided a brief review of all organizations approved for enclave access that have
 executed Data Use Agreements (DUA) and the product type(s) (commercial, Medicare, Medicaid data
 plans) used over a two-year period (2019-2021). Ms. Geryk commented that many WA-APCD data
 requestors are state agencies, all of whom use the analytic enclave. Ms. Geryk stated that the state
 appropriates about \$400K per year for agency access to the enclave.
- Mr. Sajnani asked whether the DUAs are ongoing or purpose-specific with limited amount of data. Ms. Geryk replied that the data is provided quarterly; all requestors have a term-limited DUA with WA-APCD that is renewed through a simple process and used to ensure that the requestors use cases are ongoing. The DUAs are visited annually to ensure the requestor wishes to renew and to make sure those analysts with access are continued users. Mr. Sajnani asked a question regarding product cost. Ms. Geryk briefly explained the cost based on requestors. Mr. Texidor asked whether the enclave users are assigned roles- based permissions, or do they have access to the entire enclave dataset a discussion regarding permission standards took place.
- A brief overview of several state agency use cases.
- A descriptive overview of the state's data request process: Ms. Geryk described the fee schedule
 indicating that the state calculates the cost of a custom file by an equation based on a per-member peryear count.
- A comparison of the similarities and differences between the CT and WA data release models. Ms.
 Armah inquired how WA was able to obtain workers comp data. Ms. Geryk commented that she was not involved in the process to obtain Workers Comp claims. Ms. Cote commented that she can provide more information on how WA was able to receive full workers comp data. Ms. Geryk stated that she will review the statute to determine if it is mandated.

Several questions were asked by members and staff. Ms. Armah asked if state agencies go through the same release process as other entities. Ms. Geryk stated that there is no difference in the process for requesting data. Ms. Armah asked regarding the composition of the WA Data Review Committee. Ms. Geryk indicated that she will send Ms. Armah the statutory language regarding this composition. Joseph Rus inquired about the data extract method from a technical standpoint. Mr. Sajnani inquired regarding the WA-APCD budget and cost structure for the sale of data. Ms. Geryk described the formula for charging non-state agency entities. A discussion regarding Colorado's fee structure model and the differences between CT's model and CO's model took place. Ms. Geryk commented that she is happy to speak further with the CT-APCD regarding the application process. Ms. Geryk provided an overview of the Washington HealthCare Compare website.

More information about the presentation can be found here (insert hyperlink)

Dr. Checko thanked Ms. Geryk for her presentation and stated that CT will follow up on her offer to continue discussions.



5. Data Release Application: Yale University – Understanding Trends in Healthcare Use, Cost, and Outcomes for Populations with Chronic Conditions

Dr. Chima Ndumele & Matthew Lavallee

Matthew Lavallee presented on the application for data release from Yale University regarding Understanding Trends in Healthcare Use, Cost, and Outcomes for Populations with Chronic Conditions.

Highlights from Mr. Lavallee's presentation included:

- A background overview of the data request. Mr. Lavallee indicated that the objective of the request is to study chronically ill populations in Connecticut for the privately insured commercial APCD population
- An overview of the three aims for the 2013 to 2021 APCD data. The data will be used to:
 - establish whether or not trends exist in utilization of care, cost of care, and intermediate health outcomes for chronically-ill populations in CT.
 - estimate the relationship between use of care, cost of care, and intermediate health outcomes for chronically-ill populations in CT.
 - o explore whether disparities exist in any trends or relationships across demographics such as race, gender, socioeconomic status.
- A brief overview regarding the potential value of the data which may provide:
 - o updated analysis on trends for chronically-ill populations.
 - o improved understanding of how disparities exist for chronically ill populations is still novel, and how the disparities intersect with particular health statuses.
 - o further insight into how healthcare delivery or health policy can shape delivery for these populations.
- An overview of the methods that will be used to research the data:
 - o High/low-value care metrics will be created. Hospitalization metrics will be examined. APCD data will be used to identify race, gender, county, employment sector, poverty-level, and chronic conditions to identify sub-populations. Regression techniques and risk-adjustment will be used for statistical analysis. Mr. Sajnani inquired regarding employment, poverty, and chronic conditions in the APCD. Mr. Lavallee stated that chronic conditions would be constructed based on diagnostic codes. Mr. Texidor stated that the APCD has a poverty level indicator and an employment level indicator; dependent upon the data collected at the point of care, this different insurance plans. A discussion regarding variations and variables in data took place.
- An overview of the team that will be working with the data.
- An overview of the potential data limitations that the team anticipates.
- A description of the team's data security policy and measures. Mr. Texidor asked the team to provide an updated copy of policies and procedures. Dr. Ndumele stated that the data management plan is updated annually to reflect the latest policies and procedures that are consistent with Yale policies, if any updates were made between the time of the initial application and the time of which the application was submitted, the team will provide the latest version. Upon a comment made by Dr. Checko regarding those who will be allowed to have access to the data, Dr. Ndumele clarified that the principal investigators identified will be permitted access, and that from time to time, they will have a new research assistance, but will notify the CT-APCD about any changes. Mr. Texidor noted that there is a provision in the DUA that covers staffing changes and commented that we use the CMS suppression guidelines, so we don't release any "cell size" that's greater than 11. Mr. Peng inquired regarding whether the team will be looking at chronic conditions as a whole or at each separately and asked for examples of the intermediate outcomes expected. Dr. Ndumele stated that the team will look at both



and provided examples. Dr. Ndumele further described examples of intermediate outcomes that will be looked at. Ms. Turney inquired regarding a publication. Dr. Ndumele indicated that a publication is anticipated. Yale is not able to seek approval on an application, but they will be providing it to the CT-APCD.

Dr. Checko requested a motion to approve the APCD data release application by Yale University regarding Trends in Utilization, Spending, and Quality for Chronically-III Privately-Insured Patients. The motion was made by Sheryl Turney and seconded by Justin Peng. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

6. Update on DRC Application Workgroup

Dr. Patricia Checko

2:00 PM

Dr. Checko provided an update on the DRC Application Review Workgroup.

Dr. Checko stated that the DRC Application Workgroup tried on its own to review the application process of other state's but the initiative proved beyond the small groups capacity, subsequently it had been decided to reach out to only New England states as a potential joint application initiative had been talked about. Dr. Checko announced that the current approach is to invite states to present to the full DRC. This would allow the DRC to ask questions, make assessments, and determine what changes are possible for the DRC and the HITO to make, which changes may require APCD Advisory Board review, and/or potential legislative changes to be proposed.

7. Update on Data Release Applications

Dr. Patricia Checko

Dr. Checko invited Mr. Texidor to report on data release applications. Mr. Texidor announced that three applications were reviewed and approved by the DRC in 2021:

- 1) Apperture LLC
- 2) Yale HPV-General Warts Study
- 3) UConn Phenotype Suicide Algorithm Study

Dr. Checko stated that the group had received its first publication out of the UConn study.

8. 2021 Annual APCD DRC Report

Dr. Patricia Checko

Dr. Checko announced that the annual report which was part of the group's meeting packet will be presented to the APCD Advisory Group. There were no questions about the 2021 Annual APCD DRC Report.

9. Update on Federal DOL Grant

Olga Armah

Ms. Armah presented the on the Federal DOL Grant.

• Ms. Armah stated that a \$2.5 million funding opportunity had been announced in 2021 by the federal DOL to enhance state's APCD's and analytics. A national State APCDs Advisory Committee had been established to develop recommendations, and the DOL was expected to release information regarding the application process and guidance for applying for the grant. Ms. Armah announced that other than to learn that the amount should be in appropriations, no new information has been released, and the funding has not been included in the budget appropriations; the funding is in the No Surprises bill but there are no updates regarding whether the money has been appropriated. Mr. Texidor stated that the national committee has met and are developing the standards for the creation of a unified standard to



collect APCD data, Mr. Texidor stated that the APCD Council has indicated that funding may not appear in the 2022 federal budget. Ms. Turney stated that based on the level of activity that the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) is seeing, it appears a lot of states are submitting applications and receiving funding. Ms. Turney stated that the HITECH is different from the group that is providing the federal grant and she has not heard anything regarding next steps regarding the grant application process. A discussion regarding the adoption of a common data layout and interoperability took place. Mr. Texidor stated that staff can circle back at next month's meeting with any updates or send an email to the membership.

10.	General Discussion	Dr. Patricia Checko	
	Dr. Checko expressed hope that the group will agree with the new approach to reviewing other state's APCD's. Dr. Checko stated that two vacancies continue to exist on the DRC; efforts continue to fill the seats. Dr. Check thanked members for their participation.		
11.	Meeting Adjournment	Dr. Patricia Checko	
	Dr. Checko requested a motion to adjourn the meeting	g. The motion was made by Mr. Peng. The motion passed	

Upcoming Meeting Date: March 8, 2022

All meeting information, materials, and audio/visual recordings are published on the OHS website:

https://portal.ct.gov/OHS/HIT-Work-Groups/APCD-Data-Release-Committee

