Meeting Date	Meeting Time	Location	
May 14, 2019	1:00 – 3:00 PM	Conference Rm. 3A, 450 Capitol Avenue	
		Hartford, CT 06106	

Committee Members							
Patricia Checko, Ph.D., Chair	Χ	Sheryl Turney, MS	Х	Kun Chen, Ph.D.			
Robert Blundo	Χ	Kristen McClain, JD/MBA	Х	Lisa Freeman	Χ		
Miriam Delphin-Rittmon, Ph.D		Henry Jacobs, MD/JD		Michael Fields	х		
Justin Peng, MPH	Χ	Anthony Dias, MBBS, DPM, MPH	Χ				
Supporting Leadership							
Kelsey Lawlor, UConn AIMS	Χ						

Age	nda							
	Topic	Responsible Party	Time					
1.	Welcome and Call to Order	Patricia Checko	1:05 PM					
	Patricia Checko welcomed the group to the meeting and asked for a motion to add an item to the agenda regarding the APCD Advisory Group Privacy and Security Sub-Committee information. Anthony Dias made the motion to add the item, and Mike Fields seconded the motion. The members voted to approve the motion unanimously.							
2.	Public Comment	Attendees	1:10 PM					
	There was no public comment.							
3.	Review and Approval of the March 12, 2019 Minutes	Committee Members	1:12 PM					
	Pat Checko asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the March 12, 2019 meeting. Justin Peng made the motion, Michael Fields seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously with no additions or abstentions.							
4.	Application Review and Discussion: Office of the State Comptroller	Eileen Flick, SVP Director of Health Data Solutions at The Segal Group Sandra Czunas, Health Care Analyst at OSC	1:15 PM					
	Eileen Flick of the Segal Group gave a brief overview of the proposed research project. The Comptroller's office is hoping to use the APCD data to aid them in their assessment of their recently proposed bill.							
	Pat Checko asked if the research was in relation to the proposed legislation by Office of the State Comptroller on supplying a public insurance option. The applicants confirmed that this research is related to that legislative proposal.							

Pat Checko asked for clarification on the applicant's requests for a dataset with a unique identifier. Rob Blundo clarified that there are unique identifiers within the dataset that are just for the APCD system and does not align with Employee ID numbers, for example. It is just a generated number to mask identity. Rob Blundo added that the data set could not be merged with third party datasets that could potentially deidentify the data. The Segal Group and OSC confirmed that the intent is not to deidentify the data at any point, and they will sign the DUA to that effect.

Pat Checko asked if the applicants need the state employee data set. The applicants confirmed that they are only asking for small group data sets.

Rob Blundo asked what level of detail the applicant is looking for in regards to "plan type." The applicants want to know what kind of deductibles are used, etc. Rob indicated plan benefit deductible is not available, but claim deductible portion is.

Sheryl Turney asked if the applicants would be receiving any unique identifiers. Rob Blundo stated that they would only be getting a randomly generated id number. Rob Blundo added that the data would all be deidentified. He asked the applicants their preference on getting masked date of service information vs. year-level data. Rob cautioned that if they are trying to do certain types of time-oriented research, the masked data may not work as well as just the year-level.

Sheryl Turney asked if payer and provider details are masked in the data set. Rob stated that those details are not masked. Further, he stated that the Committee should evaluate whether that is needed for research purposes in alignment with HIPAA minimum requirements.

Sheryl Turney asked if any of the research would be commercialized. The Segal Group stated that they do not have any commercialized products.

Sheryl asked why they need details for providers/payors. Applicant stated that if they could receive that information, it would provide more insight into quality and cost, but would not be used to create any kind of scorecard. Also helps understand where care is being delivered. Who is providing care and where.

Sheryl Turney asked if the data could be merged with any other data. The applicants stated that it would not be merged with any other data.

Pat Checko asked if the applicants are ok with the data destruction terms. Applicants confirmed.

Rob asked the applicant how the data would be stored to maintain security. Rob asked for a voting contingency that SG to provide more detailed security protocols.

Anthony asked if the Segal Group has any subcontractors who would have access to the data. The Segal Group stated that they do not.

Sheryl asked if any of the work would be done off shore. The Segal Group stated that there would be no work done overseas.

Justin asked if the data would be accessed by any OSC staff. Sandra stated that it is possible that she would occasionally access data if the Segal Group ran into issues. Justin asked how she would be accessing it securely. Sandy replied that it depends on how the Segal Group implements their

security architecture. Pat asked for clarification. The Segal Group responded that they would build a secure portal to house this APCD data Rob recommended that there would need to be further discussion to go over the security levels of these portals as a contingency of this release.

Pat Checko asked for a motion. Rob moved to approve the application with the contingency that OHS or the Exchange or both have a security specialist review the steps taken by the Segal Group to build a secure environment before transmitting the data to them. Mike Fields seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with no additions or abstentions.

5. Application Review and Discussion: Brown University

Jun Tao, Ph.D., Assistant Professor

2:00 PM

Jun Tao gave a brief overview of the proposed research project. They are looking to see the effect and impact of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEp) use. Their project currently has access to MA and RI APCD data.

Pat Checko asked for clarification about the Brown Stronghold. It is only accessible by unique users specified.

Pat Checko asked for more information about what kind of information they will be looking at.

The Applicant discussed that they are looking for 5-digit zip, but were informed they could only receive zip code at the 3 digit level. This is problematic for doing comparisons between urban and rural populations which is a key point of their research. Dr. Chan from Brown asked if they could receive provider addresses to determine where PrEP is being provided. Rob Blundo stated that the data set includes National Provider Identifier (NPI), which the applicant could look up the address themselves. They also requested pharmacy data and address as well as well. Dr. Chan stated that they understand the limitations of this data. A lot of this research is exploratory. Rob stated that he suggests removing 3 digit residential zip since it would not be needed to research. Dr. Chan agreed that this is a reasonable approach.

Pat Checko asked if they are looking for REL data. Rob Blundo stated that the APCD does not release REL data due to low completion rate.

Anthony Dias asked if the research would include aim #2 of their application based on the lack of GIS and REL data in the APCD. Dr. Chan answered that they would focus on the GIS of providers instead of patients. Anthony further asked how mapping provider data would tie to uptake and persistent use of PrEP. Dr. Chan answered that there's no way to measure PrEP uptake as yet, but they can use APCD data to see who is providing the medication (e.g. HIV specialists and clinics vs other providers), and see over time if PCPs are prescribing more often.

Pat Checko asked if there is an opportunity to work with DPH to get partner notification details. Dr. Chan answered that there is not as of yet, but they are interested in seeing where and if testing is being recorded.

Dr. Chan mentioned that their project currently has relationships and grants at UConn Health and Yale.

Pat Checko asked about the project's IRB application. Dr. Chan and Dr. Tao answered that the application has been submitted, and the IRB is waiting on their approval to receive APCD data.

Justin Peng stated that he has concerns about the researchers being able to identify patients based on small sample size and pharmacy/dr. location. Pat Checko stated that she does not believe that having this level of data would be identifiable. The Committee asked the applicant to confirm that they have no intention to reidentify the data or merge it with 3rd party data sources. Dr. Chan confirmed that they have no intention to reidentify this data in any manner, and have no plans to link to any other data sets. Sheryl Turney asked for clarification about how the other data would be stored. Dr. Chan stated that they would house within same data base, but there would be no overlap.

Sheryl stated that they need to be sure that the results would adhere to HIPAA sample size rules. Dr. Chan agreed.

Anthony asked if there was any other due diligence we are responsible for based on the sensitive nature of this data. Rob answered the data release evaluation criteria doesn't specifically take that into account, however the DRC does have flexibility in review criteria. He mentioned the Data Use Agreement includes additional protections.

Rob stated that there is no end data on the application. Dr. Chan stated that it is in flux based on grant funding and can update the Committee once it is finalized.

Pat Checko asked if RI or MA shared any similar concerns. Dr. Chan answered that RI gave them actual dates and 5-digit zips.

Anthony asked how they plan to manage being in compliance with the three levels of requirements for each of the three data sets. Dr. Chan stated that they would be siloed and structured, code specific to each state's APCD set.

Anthony asked if they are comfortable with the project reviews being held to CT's restrictions. Dr. Chan answered that all parties are aware that this is an exploratory process so whatever is shared would be the baseline and within scope.

Pat Checko asked for a motion to approve the application from Brown University once they provide an end data. Sheryl Turney moved to approve the application, Anthony Dias seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with no additions or abstentions.

6. Wrap up and Meeting Adjournment

Patricia Checko

2:45 PM

Pat Checko updated the Committee on her activity and role within the APCD Privacy and Security subcommittee. The APCD administrators are looking at the survival and usefulness of the data, as well as continued funding. The APCD has moved from AHCT to OHS, which creates new complexity. Pat asked for the Committee members to think about potential recommendations to make to the group. Justin and the group agreed that the use of the APCD data set could be greater. They also agreed that more information on the status of the APCD would be helpful to the group. Pat stated that she would reach out to Allan Hackney to give them an update and overview.

On this topic, Rob Blundo stated that since the transition of the APCD from AHCT to OHS is reaching its end date, he will slowly be phasing out of this project.

Rob and Pat state that they will provide more resources to the group, including the applicable CFR materials and APCD Privacy and Security Sub-Committee minutes.

Pat Checko asked the group for a motion to adjourn. Anthony Dias made the motion to adjourn, and Mike Fields seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 3pm.

Meeting information is located at: https://portal.ct.gov/OHS/HIT-Work-Groups/APCD-Data-Release-Committee