CEDARBRIDGE
GROUP

Medication Reconciliation and Polypharmacy Work Group
Technology & Innovation Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes

MEETING DATE	MEETING TIME	Location
March 28, 2019	11:00AM – 12:00PM	Tele-conference

SUBCOMMITTEE ATTENDEES					
Bruce Metz (Co-chair)	x	Nitu Kashyap		Samantha Pitts	x
Thomas Agresta (Co-chair)	x	Jennifer Osowiecki	x	Stacy Ward-Charlerie	x
Sean Jeffery	x	Marie Renauer		Phil Smith	x
Rod Marriot	x	Jennifer Boehne	x		
SUPPORTING LEADERSHIP					
Allan Hackney (OHS)		Michael Matthews (CedarBridge)	x	Sheetal Shah (CedarBridge)	x
		Chris Robinson (CedarBridge)	x	Kate Hayden (UConn Health)	

Minutes				
	Topic	**Responsible Party**		**Time**
1.	**Welcome and Call to Order**	**Tom Agresta / Bruce Metz**		**11:00 AM**
	Tom welcomed group to second meeting and provided an overview of the agenda. Jennifer Boehne provided introduced herself to the group.			
2.	**Public Comment**	**Attendees**		**11:05 AM**
	There was no public comment.			
3.	**Med Rec Hackathon – Discuss Potential Outcomes**	**Tom Agresta**		**11:10 AM**
	Tom Agresta provided an overview of the Medication Reconciliation Hackathon which will take place on April 5 and 6. Tom believes that this event will help to inform the recommendations of this Subcommittee. Tom provided an overview of the Hackathon attendees, the process, and the intended goals. Tom asked the Subcommittee members if there are any specific outcomes that would be valuable to this group. Jennifer Osowiecki asked Tom what form or category of information that he anticipates will emerge during the Hackathon. Tom said that they will receive several types of information, including the functional requirements that are needed to carry out medication reconciliation from a technical perspective. Jennifer indicated that it would be helpful to know the limitations in terms of the setting, and what barriers exist relative to the implementation. Jennifer would also be interested in knowing about patient access and input. Tom said that this was good feedback. He thinks they will try to do a white paper on the lessons learned. Michael Matthews asked how much the Hackathon will focus on the question of a single-source-of-truth / golden record, as opposed to the tools that would act upon the best available list. Phil Smith, who will be speaking at the Hackathon, said that the purpose of the event is to put our minds together to develop a conclusion. Phil wants the attendees to arrive at a conclusion, as opposed to being led to a conclusion – he is open-minded to the outcome. Stacy Ward-Charlerie agrees with Phil and is excited to see what the Hackathon brings in terms of outcomes. She thinks this group has a good sense of the problem and opportunities and is excited to learn about potential solutions. She thinks from a white-paper perspective, it would be helpful to hear about the potential			

solutions. Tom thinks this is a great way of thinking about it – from a technology perspective, we need to have something tangible for the next steps in terms of technology.

Samantha Pitts said she appreciated the discussion and agrees with what has been said so far. She would also like to see prioritization of the low-hanging fruit, and what items would be more challenging, but have a higher yield. Tom said that this was a great observation. They are planning to ask people to rank the functional requirements in terms of priority. Phil said he has a three-column methodology for looking at these discussions. The framework includes importance, practicality, and cost. Tom likes this framework and thinks this is something that this group can consider, rather than people at the Hackathon.

4.	Development of Technology Matrix: Brainstorm	Attendees	11:20 AM

Tom Agresta introduced the next topic related to the development of a technology matrix, which was discussed at the last subcommittee meeting. The matrix would give us a framework from which to think about solutions going forward. Tom does not think this group will be in a position to recommend technology at the end of this process, nor should the group be in this position, but the group does have the capacity to think through considerations.

Phil Smith said that he has used the Zachman Framework as a tool in these situations. The framework lays out who, what, where, when, why and how, and cross-walks with the business considerations, people considerations, technology considerations, and so on. It's a robust matrix that helps one think through and define the business requirements. Phil said that this tool is freely available. Phil said that this tool could be used for the purpose of developing the white paper. Tom thinks this could be used for each stakeholder group that have different solutions and could be viewed with the same logical or physical rules.

Michael Matthews said that the group should define the scope of what technology and technologies would be included and what this means in terms of solutions. For example, this could include e-prescribing, medication registry, consumer-facing tools, patient portals, pharmacy gateway like Surescripts, pharmacy information systems, and EHRs. Michael thinks it would be helpful to publish an inventory of technologies that would be under consideration and determine if there are any tools missing from the tool box. Tom asked for additional clarity about missing tools. Michael elaborated by providing an example of consumers that are not able to reliably access an accurate list of their medications. Tom said that there are lots of tools out there, but most are incomplete or inadequate currently. If they worked seamlessly, then we would see broad adoption.

Phil said he applauds what we are trying to accomplish here. He thinks a statewide project such as this has the potential to accomplish a lot. He's encouraged that Connecticut can be successful because there are only 2 states that are looking into this issue at the same level and we shouldn't be discouraged. Sean Jeffery agreed with Phil.

Jennifer Boehne said that we need to figure out how to capture data differently on the front-end. Phil agrees completely. Jennifer said it would also be great to have better data capture on over-the-counter medications. There are a lot of blind spots and it is often unclear who is responsible for data capture. Phil recommends reading his e-book, Med Wreck, as it provides a foundational understanding.

5.	Discuss Initial Recommendations	Attendees	11:35 AM

Tom asked Michael to discuss the timeline and approach for gathering initial recommendations. Michael said that the Subcommittee needs to have the report and recommendations completed by June, which means the group needs to make a lot of progress in April to ensure everything comes together in May. Michael suggested that the group can start to brainstorm recommendations via email. If everyone can send 1-2 ideas on recommendations, this will give us the opportunity to discuss, vet, and prioritize at the next meeting.

Bruce likes this idea given the timeframe. Bruce said there are two buckets – the brainstormed recommendations that Michael is discussing and the technology recommendations that will be needed to enable the other subcommittee recommendations. It would be good to factor this in and review the draft recommendations from the other subcommittees. Michael agrees, as they had talked about cross subcommittee communication. Once email strings get some traction, we can capture this in a concise fashion.

	The Policy sub-committee is in the same place, they are interested in determining the policy levers that can be used to enable recommendations of other subcommittees.		
6.	**Next Steps and Adjournment**	**Tom Agresta / Bruce Metz**	**3:55 PM**
	Tom provides summary and update of the immediate next steps: 1. Development of technology matrix 2. Development of technical definitions and data dictionary 3. Development of Process diagrams: Michael informed group that Jennifer Boehne said she could help to develop a process diagram, utilizing Phil Smith's diagram and the CancelRx diagram as a starting place. 4. Development and validation of recommendations 5. Make assignments to other subcommittees Bruce indicated that they will need to see what the first two items look like and how they can translate that into laymen's terms. He wants to make sure the recommendations are easily digestible, especially for the legislature. Tom agrees. Michael said he will coordinate to make sure the subcommittees are collaborating effectively. Phil wants to ensure that they have a very compelling background story about why this is such a critical issue. He also suggests that this section be done before April and divide the white paper into other sections. The outline, background section, list of contributors, internal MRP process and glossary could reasonably done by first week of May. Tom decides to take the conversation offline as they are over 5 minutes. The next meeting will be held on April 25, 2019 at 11am.		

Upcoming Meeting Schedule: Future meetings will be scheduled at a later date
Meeting information is located at: https://portal.ct.gov/OHS/HIT-Work-Groups/Medication-Reconciliation-and-Polypharmacy-Work-Group