

New Mexico Health Information System (HIS) Act Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2020

**New Mexico Hospital Association
7471 Pan American Fwy
Albuquerque, NM 87109**

HIS Advisory Committee Members present:

Jeff Dye – New Mexico Hospital Association
Mark Epstein – Health Insurance Provider (True Health New Mexico)
Kristina Fisher – Health Consumer Group (Think New Mexico)
Nadini Kuehn – Health Policy
Todd Sandman – Health Care Provider (Presbyterian Health Services)
Russell Toal – Office of Superintendent of Insurance
Janice Torrez – Health Insurance Provider (BCBS)
Judy Williams – Health Data
Anthony Yepa – Health Consumer

Members not present:

Robert Doucette – Office of Superintendent of Insurance
Mike Landen – New Mexico Department of Health (NMDOH), Chair
Ryan O’Connor – Human Services Department (HSD)
Bill Patten – Health Care Organization (Taos Holy Cross)
Bonnie White – Health Care Organization (UNMH)

Other Attendees:

Ken Geter – Community & Health Systems Epidemiology Bureau, DOH
Keaton Hughes – Community & Health Systems Epidemiology Bureau, DOH (by Phone and Zoom)
Ellen Interlandi – New Mexico Hospital Association
Dan Lanari – Health Care Organization (NMHA)
Lori Zigich – Community & Health Systems Epidemiology Bureau, DOH

Review of Meeting Minutes from December 9 meeting

- Minutes approved.

Review Agenda

- Agenda Approved.

APCD Updates (Ken Geter and Keaton Hughes)

- Staffing
 - IT Project Manager – currently creating a scope of work to have a consultant manage the APCD.
 - Public health data scientist position was approved by the State Personnel Office and is now with the personnel office in DOH. It is an analyst and evaluator position.
- Contracts
 - Freedman Healthcare will facilitate acquisition of Medicare data and provide toolkits for DOH to acquire the data going forward. Will initially request 2-3 years of historical data. The data may be shared with HSD.
 - Real Time Solutions, Inc. is seeking expert input on how other states are presenting and publishing healthcare-related costs through public facing websites. The vendor will propose a minimum of five websites for further review by DOH and stakeholders.
- Funding
 - \$900,000 had been previously approved and anticipate the second year of \$900,000 will be approved but waiting for the budget to be signed by the Governor.
 - Currently working with HSD to pursue enhanced Medicaid matching maintenance funds. There is no expiration of these funds.
- Draft RFP for technical design
 - Refined RFP in accordance with stakeholders, state agencies, and the Governor's office and was approved by DoIT.
 - The procurement officer in the State Purchasing Department is currently reviewing and will work with DOH on the final draft and timelines.
- Questions, answers, comments and recommendations
 - What is the process with rule making and timeline with the RFP? Answer: drafting rules and regulations and working internally with legal and plan to work with other state partners. Should get feedback from legal in 4-5 weeks.
 - Will draft rules go out for public comment? Answer: Yes.
 - How do other states manage proprietary issues? Does DOH have anyone assigned to this? Answer: Offered to have this included in the Frequently Asked Questions section of the Stakeholder Engagement Report, adding that stakeholders will continue talking about this.
 - How about proprietary information about insurance companies and information on what you can't ask patients, e.g., race/ethnicity is a mandatory by the Affordable Care Act? Answers: Keep in mind it's a claims database which does not necessarily have demographics. The APCD will have the ability to link records between various data systems. Also, planning to work closely with stakeholders on developing a Master Patient Index.
 - Who will comprise the APCD technical design RFP review team? Everyone is from DOH. Concern was expressed by Committee Members about everyone being from DOH. Need someone HSD (subject matter experts), a health economist, people that are either generating or using the APCD data (e.g., hospital), consumers. Persons outside of state government can provide input but cannot score the proposals and must sign a non-disclosure agreement.
 - How about government communications subject matter experts? Who is monitoring and enforcing the rules and regulations that we come up with? Does OSI has immediate regulatory authority over carriers? OSI answer: This is a DOH contract.

- On Medicare, need someone on the IT side. Terry Reusser should reach out to Shaun.

Draft Stakeholder Engagement Report

Committee Members noted that some questions from stakeholders had not been answered. Keaton mentioned that NAHDO is currently creating a Frequently Asked Questions to attach to the report. An APCD 101 will also be included to inform stakeholders who were unable to participate in last fall's meetings or focus group discussions.

Washington Healthcare Compare Public Transparency Website Q&A (via Zoom Meeting)

- Lorie Geryk from the Washington State Health Care Authority provided an overview of timeline/project milestones in an effort to answer many of the questions HIS Advisory Committee members had from the December 9 presentation. Lorie has been the APCD Program Manager for three years.
- Form One is the website vendor, and Onpoint is the data vendor.
- Monique Cote from Onpoint Health Data provided an overview of standing up the database with a focus on provider data review and website data extract creation.
- Bridget Veerhoff discussed the HealthCare Compare Public Transparency website development and recent usability testing work.
 - Successes based on strong partners, comprehensive scope of work, the legislative starting point of being one of 17 mandated APCDs in the U.S. according to the APCD Council website. Also noted on the website that West Virginia, California and New Mexico are currently implementing APCDs.
 - Recommend reaching out to Colorado as Washington has used them as a model.
 - Have a data release committee. Have 55 data submitters. The first submission included historical data. At this stage, can look at the costs incurred, and infrastructure needed. From the submitter standpoint, no additional App is needed.
 - Use CDL plus Washington-specific fields if needed by statute or for stakeholders needing a specific field. Each year, review candidate data elements.
 - Launch of public website – June 2018. Each year work to refresh cost and quality data.
 - There are many data validation efforts that occur before putting posting on website.
 - Consider sources of data, timeliness, where it's going. Medicare, Medicaid, commercial, CMS fee for service data – first received by state then given to Onpoint. There is about a 14-month lag of Medicare and fee for service data.
 - Make updates to the website on annual basis with most recent data available – about a year lag.
 - How does Washington evaluate the effectiveness of the APCD? We partner very closely to make sure data is supporting the program and making it effective. Produce quarterly abstracts as a way of collaborating with data researchers and policy people to make sure APCD is being effective. Still in early stages of evaluating effectiveness of the website for consumer but look at how many people have come to the site, as well as conduct feasibility studies using Validate Link - this is a fast and easy way to address feedback.
 - One big lesson learned is to build out the core first and solidly and then as time and budget allow. Initially built to present one year of data. Then learn from and adapt along the way.

- A Committee Member asked if Washington used charge masters from the facilities listed on the website. Internal measures were used. Used average allowed amount. Sum of all costs associated with the service. Based on claims.
- Ranks are based on reliability scoring. Organizations are provided the opportunity to review the scores before they are posted on the website.
- Medicare – state just handles CMS fee for service data.
- Engage in solid research early on. Determine specific audiences. Hone in on primary use cases for those audiences. Review with partners on a regular basis. Shift along the way as needed.
- Work is continuing to map claims data elements. Deciding presentation requirements for website build. Scope of work and workplan is very important in building the website. There are some portions of this that are more manual and labor-intensive.
- Washington concluded their presentation by wishing NM APCD well and offering their availability for future questions.

Next Steps

- Give HIS Advisory Committee members notice when the APCD Technical Design RFP posts.
- Waiting for the legislative session to end and for the governor to sign the budget to determine next steps with the APCD.
- Identify potential external stakeholders to review the APCD RFP.
- At the next meeting, provide a broad timeline addressing the questions that came up today and how all the questions raised this afternoon relate.

Next Meeting

- Tuesday, May 12, 1:30-3:00 pm in Santa Fe (location to be announced).