

All Payer Claims Database Data Release Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date	Meeting Time	Location
August 13, 2019	1:00-3:00 PM	Meeting Location: OPM Conference Rm. 3A, 450 Capitol Avenue Hartford, CT 06106

Committee Members					
Patricia Checko, Ph.D., Chair	X	Sheryl Turney, MS	X	Kun Chen, Ph.D.	X
Robert Blundo		Kristen McClain, JD/MBA		Lisa Freeman	X
Miriam Delphin-Rittmon, Ph.D. Appointee**		Henry Jacobs, MD/JD		Michael Fields	X
Justin Peng, MPH	X	Anthony Dias, MBBS, DPM, MPH	X		
Supporting Leadership					
Adrian Texidor, OHS	X	Tina Kumar, OHS	X	Dawn Bonder, CedarBridge	X
Chris Wyvill, OHS	X				

Agenda			
	Topic	Responsible Party	Time
1.	Welcome & Call to Order	Patricia Checko	1:05 PM
2.	Public Comment	Attendees	1:10 PM
	There was no public comment.		
3.	Review and Approval of the June 11, 2019 Minutes	Committee Members	1:10 PM
	Pat Checko asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the DRC meeting on June 11, 2019. Michael Fields made the motion to approve, Anthony Dias seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with no additions or abstentions.		
4.	Introduction of New OHS APCD Project Manager, Adrian Texidor	Dr. Pat Checko	1:15 PM
	Pat Checko introduced The Office of Health Strategy's New APCD Project Manager, Adrian Texidor. Adrian will be providing support to the Data Release Committee, as well as the Data Privacy and Security Subcommittee, he will also provide support to the Medication Reconciliation and Polypharmacy work group.		
5.	Overview of APCD Data Privacy and Security Subcommittee Final Report	Dawn Bonder, CedarBridge	1:45 PM
	<p>Pat introduced Dawn Bonder from CedarBridge who presented an overview from the Data Privacy and Security Subcommittee. Dawn's presentation highlights what's new and different about the guidelines, particularly how they affect us and how the DRC does business, and an opportunity to be aware of the barriers and overall changes.</p> <p>Dawn's presentation can be referred to on slides 7-22 here.</p> <p>Pat commented to make the following changes to <i>the Applications Disposition Overview</i> Slide (pg. 15), as it has been updated as of June:</p> <p>Comments on <i>Data Release Committee Specific Recommendations</i> slide (pg. 19):</p> <p>Pat added that the new Commissioner of DSS is now on board and will be participating, and therefore a member on the committee.</p> <p>One issue that we will have to deal with is whether or not that individual sitting in their capacity has authority to approve an application for Medicaid or whether it would need to have an additional review.</p>		

All Payer Claims Database Data Release Committee

Meeting Minutes

Pat added that with Allan Hackney there are 11 members of this committee.

Anthony Dias asked if we are treating the APCD data as a whole or APCD plus Medicaid.

Allan answered that the statute says that if they need Medicaid data, it has to be explicitly approved by Medicaid. The nuance was trying to find a way, so we don't put people through one process, and then an additional process.

Dawn continued her presentation.

Pat commented on the *Data Release Committee Specific Recommendations* slide (pg. 19), that the Executive Director of OHS does have authority to veto anything we do, but the procedure was modified to require the ED to give rationale of why it has been vetoed, and to explain why it did not meet one of the standards for approval. She also clarified that the Executive Director is Vicki Veltri.

On August 8th, 2019, the APCD Advisory group met and were presented with the draft final report and recommendations from subcommittee. The advisory group affirmed these recommendations and did take official action adding the chair of the Data Release Committee to the advisory group. Pat Checko is officially a member of the APCD Advisory Group.

Notes regarding *CT Regulatory Process* diagram (pg. 22):

The CT regulatory process is complex. The next steps now that we have recommendations in place, are they are going to the (OHS) agency, and Vicki Veltri (Executive Director) and staff will review and format recommendations, and make changes necessary to allow the regulatory process to move as smooth as possible. To set expectations, these are recommendations that will now move through the formal process –the Advisory Groups will not have control during this.

Additional questions were addressed following the Overview of APCD Data Privacy and Security Subcommittee Final Report Presentation:

Pat asked that on page 24 ii of the Final Report, it speaks to conditional approval, and is redundant language. In conditional approval the motion speaks to what changes need to be addressed in order for approval to be met.

Also, on page 25: “*may*” requirement to destroy data.

Allan noted that there are certain circumstances where you want data to exist, e.g., recipients with on-going approvals or need to maintain data. The group came up with idea that it should be *may*, vs. shall.

On page 25 9c appeals, Pat was under impression they were required to send a copy of proposed publication. Dawn answered that recollection that committee said it should be put in data use agreement.

Pat asked how the group feels about where we go from here, and how we think this can be improved.

Pat commented that our state statute is covered by what HIPPA allows and asked what the conditions are that HIPPA covers.

Currently, we are allowed to give de-identified data only. That includes removal of 18 specified identifiers. It also includes masking of dates. We are allowed to give the first three numbers of zip

All Payer Claims Database Data Release Committee

Meeting Minutes

The HITO also has ability to allow certain personnel of OHS to have access to a limited data set. The Limited Data Set does not allow for the total zip code. It allows for the initial three digits of a zip code to be displayed if the geographic area has more than 20K people. "It must be changed to 000 if the area contains fewer than 20K people. Also, if the geographic unit formed by combining all zip codes with the same three initial digits contains more than 20K people. Dates such as admission, discharge, service, DOB, and DOD are permitted in an LDS.

Pat asked if anyone in the group has explored any other APCDs online.

Michael Fields shared that he has navigated through New Hampshire and Maine's public site, which both looked at cost transparency on a county basis.

Michael added that in Utah they made a run as a demonstration where people come in to look at projects supported by the APCD and were regionalized around transparency. There is a four-state partnership that included Oregon, Colorado, Massachusetts, and Maryland that did comparisons between utilizations and preventative measures at different age groups.

Pat asked Dawn If she was aware of the ones that are mature enough that have consumer facing APCDs.

Dawn answered that the consumer facing websites that are sharing data are really sharing data around cost and quality. Some have reports that dig deeper into health metrics by region, or zip code, but all of the public data are pursuant to legislation and statute that permit that data to be shared publicly.

In the situation in CT, the question is what the current legislation intends for data to be shared, types of data shared and how it is to be shared. This would need a review of the statute from a state perspective to counsel to say how we interpret the statute.

Pat asked if you can you release semi-identified or data that has more identifiers for the purposes of research, which is separate?

Dawn believes that you have authority to release cost and pricing legislatively. The question is from operational perspective on who's going to fund, manage, stand that up, check accuracy, what's being calculated.

Michael Fields asked that among applicants that did receive the acceptance for approval, is there an opportunity to go back and survey those applicants based on their utilization?

Pat Checko doesn't see why not and thinks it will be a good exercise for the DRC group to give them more information and bring back to the advisory group.

Michael Fields asked Dawn Bonder if the variability of the stakeholders that were covered by the agencies that had been assessed that were set up in the APCD in the different states?

Dawn answered that no, they had not spoken with stakeholders as the environmental scan didn't dive that deep.

Michael clarified his question that for the agencies that they did speak with, were there differences in how they perceived who their stakeholders were.

All Payer Claims Database Data Release Committee

Meeting Minutes

Dawn answered, that no, overall there was alignment with who they thought their stakeholder were, the consumers were biggest variable, the extent to which they involved the stakeholders in the processes.

Pat added that the idea of doing a survey would be great and asked for volunteers from the group. Michael Fields, Sheryl Turney, and Pat agreed to help.

Adrian volunteered to provide the DRC group with data which has all 15 data authorizations, and stages they are in so that we can determine which researchers to contact. Brown has not received data yet, to provide questions to individual researchers.

Action items to pursue mechanism to survey people who have the data and assess where they are in process.

Pat asked if we wanted to do anything in writing in terms of the new guidelines. The Privacy and Security Group decided it had a narrow challenge to look at what exists and bring it up to date. The group clearly was not willing to go beyond that nor authorized.

Michael Fields asked for a motion to support the recommended types of information to report back to advisory group and ask that they form a group to pursue it.

Pat called for a motion, Michael Fields made a motion, and Justin seconded motion. The motion was accepted unanimously.

Allan commented that The Data Privacy and Security Committee separated procedure from policy. There are gray areas in the procedures which statute is wider to do things than what was in procedural aspects. In the procedures there were a number of areas that Access Health owned and suggested this is an opportunity for this group to look at procedures that allow the discussion. The joining consortium is a self-imposed rule. There are a lot of the procedural parts that this group can pick up and make some recommendations.

Pat added that she is unhappy with application form. We would like to know what the applicant would like to do. We shouldn't have to wait until we are all in the same room to find out what they are really trying to say and suggested the DRC group determine what this form should look like.

Adrian Texidor mentioned the new website OHS launched, [Healthscorect.com](https://healthscorect.com) which includes a feature to submit applications, along with procedures and the entire process of submitting a data request.

Allan commented on the Healthscore website that there is a cost estimator tab, where the APCD data will eventually go.

6.	Adjournment	Dr. Patricia Checko	2:30 PM
-----------	--------------------	----------------------------	----------------

	Pat Checko asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Justin Peng made a motion; Michael Fields seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.
--	---

Upcoming Meeting Dates: September 10th, October 8th

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