California Health & Human Services Agency
Center for Data Insights and Innovation
Data Exchange Framework Implementation Advisory Committee and Data Sharing Agreement (DSA) Policies and Procedures (P&P) Subcommittee Meeting
Chat Log (12:30 PM – 3:00 PM PT, November 7, 2024)

The following comments were made in the Zoom chat log by Members of the IAC, DSA P&P Subcommittee, and staff during the November 7, 2024 meeting:

15:29:48 From Kevin McAvey to Hosts and panelists:

let's mess w it next time

15:30:23 From Kevin McAvey to Hosts and panelists:

Folks in the room are welcome to join via their links so long as they MUTE their mics and volume

15:33:30 From Kevin McAvey to Hosts and panelists:

Reminder to IAC and DSA P&P members: PLEASE use the chat replying to "Everyone" with notes, questions, and suggestions throughout today's meeting. We will be covering a lot of ground, and the chat recording will be our way of hearing more from you than our time-to-discuss will allow alone.

15:45:13 From Matthew Eisenberg to Everyone:

For anyone who wants to learn more about USCDI https://www.healthit.gov/isp/united-states-core-data-interoperability-uscdi

15:45:47 From Steven Lane to Everyone:

It would be great to have the then current US HHS Assistant Secretary for Technology Policy (ASTP) or one of the other soon to be identified leaders in that office to review ASTP/ONC priorities in the new administration and review DxF alignment with TEFCA and other HHS initiatives.

15:48:06 From Matthew Eisenberg to Everyone:

I agree with Steven that the CA DxF MUST align with the federal USCDI advancement requirements (e.g. V3 by Jan 2026). If we do not align, we add burden to data sharing participants. In addition, as noted previously, since there is no true "network", there is no technical way to monitor compliance with USCDI versions.

15:51:53 From Tom Schwaninger, L.A. Care Health Plan to Everyone:

Since many of us need to comply with both Federal ASTP/ONC requirements and DxF requirements, I don't even know how we would manage to be on two different standards simultaneously.

15:51:55 From Matthew Eisenberg to Everyone:

For many provider sites that use Epic Systems software, as has been reported elsewhere, we are already moving to Version 3! https://www.healthcareitnews.com/news/epic-apis-move-uscdi-v3

15:57:58 From Steven Lane to Everyone:

Agree with Tom and Matt that we need to align DxF with federal standards.

15:59:29 From Steven Lane to Everyone:

Also, the advancements in USCDI are designed specifically to support whole personal care and not only the needs of providers.

16:00:08 From Matthew Eisenberg to Everyone:

Apologies... I have to drop but hope to return in a bit. Thanks! Matt

16:00:18 From Tom Schwaninger, L.A. Care Health Plan to Everyone:

Yes, plans regulated by CMS do require alignment with ASTP/ONC Standards for API's already in effect and more coming in 2026.

16:00:34 From Belinda Luu to Everyone:

We agree with Matt that we need to align the CA State standard to the Federal standard. It is difficult to implement 2 separate standards and will be a hurdle to adoption and implementation.

16:00:47 From Sunny Lowell to Hosts and panelists:

Good Afternoon - apologies for joining late; joining on behalf of the Dept. of State Hospitals.

16:03:11 From Belinda Luu to Everyone:

We should also keep in mind that the ONC timelines are for vendors, not providers, so the DxF requirements may need to provide additional time for providers to implement the vendor's technology (if, for example, the vendor does not release the technology until the deadline).

16:09:15 From Justin Yoo (he/him) to Everyone:

See the DxF webpage (Public Comment) section for the draft DxF Roadmap and instructions for comment. https://www.cdii.ca.gov/committees-and-advisory-groups/data-exchange-framework/#public-comment

16:10:11 From Jonah Frohlich to Everyone:

Yes please Rim - we can take questions after each section.

16:10:55 From Mark Savage to Hosts and panelists:

Mark Savage joining.

16:14:04 From Belinda Luu to Everyone:

Regarding identity service regarding Event Notifications. We strongly recommend that this identity service be Federated instead of Centralized. Any centralized service would be a target

for cyber threats and governance would be challenging regarding liability. We support an identity service, but would strongly recommend for this to be Federated.

16:15:29 From Lee Tien to Everyone:

What sort of protections are there for individuals undergoing sensitive events (reproductive health, gender affirming care) with respect to states or persons in states that may lead to problems for patients if they are identified?

16:29:42 From Rim Cothren, CalHHS CDII to Everyone:

Thank you, Lee, for your comment. Agree that this is an important consideration, not only for exchange in general but also specifically for notifications.

16:41:39 From Belinda Luu to Everyone:

This is a follow-on to my prior comment. It will be a challenging goal to create a statewide centralized identity management system and will require cooperation with the Participant's EHR vendors to provide compatible technology to make this a reality. Also, a centralized consent management system would be incredibly performance heavy if all transactions need to first check with the centralized system to see if authorization is required first. This could significantly slow down the speed of exchange for the vast majority of transactions that do not require authorization. That is why we recommend a federated identity management system.

16:43:11 From Louis Cretaro to Everyone:

We can't expect staff to step outside of their system, to indicate consent, modify consent or remove consent. In my opinion, each field should have a consent flag tied to the individual within each system . So data is not released without consent. The consent can be discussed with the consumer each time they are in contact with that consumer.

16:52:36 From Louis Cretaro to Everyone:

I regret that I have to leave due to a prior commitment. Thank you all so much for the opportunity to share concerns and considerations.

16:55:03 From Felix Su to Everyone:

We do not share the view that a statewide centralized identity management system would necessarily be performance heavy, nor that all transactions would need to check with the centralized system first. There are models that could make this streamlined through intermediaries like QHIOs verifying consent on behalf of DxF participants (e.g., a FHIR-API linkage with the ASCMI form tied to the individual). A federated system risks both redundant builds and lack of local crossover.

16:56:11 From Kiran Savage-Sangwan to Hosts and panelists:

Can you add a recommendation here for a central focus on health equity and equal access to meaningful consent? Things like language access are very important here and don't seem to be considered.

16:57:29 From William (Bill) Barcellona to Hosts and panelists:

I hear you Jonah. Call me. :)

17:00:53 From John Helvey to Everyone:

I agree with Felix's comment

17:01:13 From Aaron Goodale to Everyone:

Also agree with Felix.

17:01:41 From Dan Chavez to Hosts and panelists:

Perhaps form an equity and equality subcommittee for the roadmap?

17:10:21 From Steven Lane to Everyone:

Given TEFCA's plans to focus initially on supporting eCR, eLR, and public health queries for data, it would seem advisable that we look for opportunities to align our DxF scope and technical requirements with those being promulgated by ASTP/CDC/RCE for use within TEFCA.

17:11:33 From Steven Lane to Everyone:

Also I understand that CDC has funding to drive jurisdictional use of TEFCA exchange, though who knows how this might change in the new year.

17:13:54 From Matthew Eisenberg to Everyone:

There are only 2 health systems that I'm aware of who are using Epic to provide FULL electronic case reporting to CDPH (via the AIMS platform). That would be Sutter and us at Stanford Health Care. If you want to learn more about our experience, I'm happy to help. Syndromic Surveillance is original Meaningful Use technology and ONLY supported by limited counties (e.g. San Mateo YES, Santa Clara NO).

17:13:58 From Dan Chavez to Hosts and panelists:

Yes agree @Rim

17:14:01 From Mark Savage to Everyone:

Just noting that DxF is agnostic about exchange, so yes, TEFCA, but alignment with other methods of exchange, too, e.g. FHIR APIs, etc.

17:19:24 From Belinda Luu to Everyone:

Is there any value in reporting out on how many Participants are new to participating in QHIOs or national networks after signing the DxF agreement. The idea is to show how the DxF may have accelerated participation of organizations who were not participating in these networks before. This seems like an easy metric to track and may be an opportunity to demonstrate the tangible successes of the DxF.

17:22:43 From Belinda Luu to Everyone:

Wonderful discussion and appreciate everyone's insights! I need to drop.

17:29:26 From Felix Su to Everyone:

Strongly support and glad to see recommendation to (continue) pursuing legislative action to refine DxF governance and introduce oversight authorities and leverage peer agency regulatory enforcement mechanisms

17:32:16 From Felix Su to Everyone:

I apologize, I will need to drop early as well but thank you all as always for the opportunity/discussion

17:33:46 From Matthew Eisenberg to Everyone:

I need to drop but one nice bit of somewhat related local news - San Mateo County Health has implemented the Epic EHR and we are seeing new integrated exchange between Stanford Health Care and San Mateo County Health. Great news for our community and congrats to San Mateo County Health! (Sorry if this came up earlier).

17:38:08 From Ryan Vu to Everyone:

Monday, December 9, 2024!

17:44:48 From William (Bill) Barcellona to Hosts and panelists:

Thank you!

17:44:49 From Justin Yoo (he/him) to Alice K - Events(direct message):

next slide please

17:45:23 From Nick Picinich to Hosts and panelists:

https://www.cdii.ca.gov/committees-and-advisory-groups/data-exchange-framework/#public-comment

17:45:37 From David Ford to Hosts and panelists:

For the 2025 calendar: https://www.cmadocs.org/healthit

17:45:38 From Nick Picinich to Hosts and panelists:

Sharing the link again for public comment on DxF Roadmap

17:46:05 From Dan Chavez to Hosts and panelists:

Thank you!