



PMIX Technical Subcommittee

Date/time: Wednesday, June 16th at 3-4p ET (2-3p CT, 1-2p MT, 12-1p PT)

Link: [Microsoft Teams](#) **Dial-in:** 850-739-6261 **Meeting ID:** 724366885#

Conference Call Attendance

Affiliation:	Name:	Attendance:
State Representatives:		
California	Tina Farales; Bhaskar Rudrakshala	N
Georgia	Shari Ramchal	Y
Kentucky	Julio Mendoza, Jean Hall	Y
Maine	Jennifer Marlowe	N
Massachusetts	Rodd Kelly	N
Nebraska	Naresh Sundar Rajan	N
North Carolina	Depris Price	Y
Ohio	Chad Garner	N
Pennsylvania	Stan Murzynski	Y
Utah	Phil Brewster	Y
Washington	Matthew Reid, Eric Grace	N
Other:		
Appriss	Clay Rogers	Y
BizTek	Diwakar Cherukumilli	N
Carradora	Mike Flanigan	Y
DrFirst	Chuck Bedel	Y
IJIS Institute/Tetrus	Robert May, Michael Costigan, Ron Larsen, Melissa Winesburg, Art Kleinschmidt	Y
NIC	Celena Wheeler	N
PastRx	Robert Cassidy	N
Logicoy	Fred Aabedi	N
OpiSafe	Chris Ennis	N
Scriptulate	Nilu Kundagrami	Y
Tom Carlson Consulting	Tom Carlson	N
Committee Support:		
PDMP TTAC	Jim Giglio, Patrick Knue	Y

Conference Call Agenda/Minutes

➤ Roll Call (12)

No quorum established.

➤ Approval of Meeting's Minutes from 5-19-2021

Tabled until next meeting.

➤ Proposed Schemas Discussion

Jean Hall (KY) mentioned that another option has been proposed for the Alternate Metadata Schema. She convened a meeting on June 14th with PDMP vendors to discuss. She shared her schema presentation with the subcommittee. Clay Rogers (Appriss) stated that Appriss would be supportive of this alternate since it matches their current system without having to update their request/response processes. No other comments to take back to the PMIX Executive Committee.

➤ GOAL: Hub to Hub Interoperability - Document the previous work that proved the feasibility of hub to hub interoperability. Consider whether this should be a standard.

The subcommittee discussed the possible pros and cons of this goal:

Pros:

- Hub availability when one hub is down
- Connectivity across all states regardless of hub used

Cons:

- Key management between the hubs
- Message decryption between the hubs.
- Impact response time
- Contractual agreements for interoperability
- Differing payload formats between hubs

Mike Flanigan (Carradora) stated it would be helpful if the encryption process for both hubs could be diagrammed for review and suggested developing use case scenarios as to how it could work. The diagram should show the workflow, security, payload structure, encryption, and request/response processing.

- **GOAL: Multi-state health system rules sets in different states; explain challenges/opportunities**

Jean Hall (KY) stated that states are implementing different rules for querying PDMPs; for health systems querying multiple states, they have to accommodate all the different requirements. She suggested that this subcommittee could identify the requirements and publish a directory of requirements as a guidance document for health systems. Chuck Bedel (DrFirst) said that it would be helpful for guidance on integration across the states; maybe an interactive map showing which states allow integrations under which requirements. The subcommittee members present (8) decided that it be recommended to the PMIX Executive Committee that this resource be developed for health/pharmacy systems.

- **Other Business**

Not covered due to time.

- **Next Meeting – Wednesday, July 21st at 3-4p ET**

➤ Goals

GOAL	Technical
Explore best practices in EHR integration/interstate data sharing queries	1st
Hub to Hub Interoperability - Document the previous work that proved the feasibility of hub to hub interoperability. Consider whether this should be a standard.	1st
Identify functionality for data sharing hubs	2nd
Multi-state health system rules sets in different states; explain challenges/opportunities	2nd