PMIX Operations Subcommittee

Date/time: Tuesday, July 12th, 1-2p ET (12-1p CT, 11a-12p MT, 10-11a PT)
Meeting Link: [Microsoft Teams](#) **Dial-in:** 850-739-6261 **Meeting ID:** 951243620#

Conference Call Attendance

Affiliation:	Name:	Attendance:
State Representatives:		
California	Tina Farales	N
Delaware	Jason Slavoski	N
Florida	Erika Marshall	N
Georgia	Vlad Schorstein	N
Kentucky	Jean Hall, Heather Kollar	Y
Maine	Jennifer Marlowe	Y
Nebraska	Kevin Borcher	Y
New York	Kassandra Palmer, Alexa Bontempo, Shirley Madewell, Dave Flashover	N
Washington	Jennifer Kang	Y
Other:		
Bamboo Health	Natalie Browning, Austin Lehman, Jacob Cooper, Zohaib Salim	Y
IJIS	Robert May	Y
Logicoy	Fred Aabedi	N
NABP	Danna Droz	Y
NIC	Christie Frick, Kelly Parker	N
OpiSafe	Chris Ennis	N
Scriptulate	Neil Chatterlee, MD	N
Sherry Green & Associates	Sherry Green	Y
Tetrus	Sanjay Ungarala	N
Invited Guests		
BizTek	Denise Robertson	N
Committee Support:		
CDC	Wes Sargent	N
ONC	Carmen Smiley	N
PDMP TTAC	Patrick Knue, Don Vogt	Y

<div align="center">**Conference Call Agenda/Minutes**</div>

➢ Roll Call

Quorum not established.

➢ Approval of Minutes from 6-14-2022

Approval of minutes tabled until next meeting.

➢ Patient Matching Workgroup

Kevin Borcher (NE) stated that the workgroup discussed possible updates to the ASAP standard that might benefit patient matching; such as: prescriber location, patient identifiers, address fields to comply with Project US@ specifications, zip code (change to not remove hyphen), patient name (follow AHIMA guidelines – e.g., no extra notes, no special characters, person's legal first and last name, add fields for proper, alias, insurance patient names), future fill dates, etc. If all these suggestions are implemented by ASAP, it will greatly impact pharmacies, vendors, and PDMPs; no foreseeable impact to PMIX at this time. Kevin Borcher (NE) added that the timeframe for new ASAP standards: September meeting, schedule 3-4 stakeholder meetings, voting on recommendations, early 2023 updated version would be released, and approximately 12-18 months after approval to be effective and implemented.

➢ Subcommittee Goal #1 revisited: Define baseline functionality of interoperability hubs. Benefits/Challenges of hub interoperability:
- State A prefers Hub A and State B prefers Hub B – if hubs do not communicate, then data sharing is limited; if no standard 'national' hub, then data exchange becomes more difficult
- If national standards are in place, then most barriers to interoperability go away
- Hub interoperability would allow PDMPs to use their preferred hub and still connect to all other PDMPs
- Transparency on dashboards on hub transactions (i.e., number of requests/responses)
- Security when data throughout transmission process
- Universal standard for data elements being transmitted
- Standardize terminology across hubs
- Standardize role mapping across states/hubs
- Standardize minimum functionality on hub consoles (i.e., state contacts, state user roles allowed, data sharing agreements)

- Establish minimum time frame for system availability for hubs
- Establish minimum time frame to provide support to respond to help requests for hubs
- Establish minimum security standard certification for hubs

Kevin Borcher (NE) asked subcommittee members to review the above list and offer additional suggestions. Jean Hall (KY) stated that the PMIX National Standards have data exchange standards, communications standards, and security standards, so what other 'national standards'? Kevin Borcher (NE) asked if the current standards are sufficient for new hubs to be implemented and work with all PDMPs? Jean Hall (KY) mentioned that there are no 'standards' developed for the make-up of the admin consoles with the hubs, but she believes existing standards are sufficient. Kevin Borcher (NE) should PMIX consider adding in FHIR or JSON capabilities since PMIX currently only allows XML? This could be a topic for the PMIX Technical Subcommittee to discuss. Group decided to reword the bullet about "if national standards are in place …." since standards are there. Edited bullet on security standards and Kevin Borcher (NE) asked group to review the posted standards - http://www.pdmpassist.org/pdf/Information%20Security%20Standard%20Final_20180509.pdf. Next meeting group will discuss whether to 'require' that minimum security standards are met.

- Subcommittee Goal #2: Explore best practices in EHR integration/interstate data sharing. Potential practices to explore:
  - Seamless queries between workflow integration
  - Accurate and complete patient matching
  - Rapid response times for data or display
  - Support for Support Act metrics for a qualified PDMP
  - Having delegate access and audit trails tied to the delegator
  - Monitoring of transaction metrics
  - Review and comparison of state-to-state sharing rules
  - Provider authorization
  - Legal requirements
  - Access to audit data
  - Develop resources and training for users on integration/integration data sharing
  - Develop resources and training about onboarding process to identify responsibilities for PDS, EHR, HIE, PDMPs
  - Error and notification messaging

Not covered due to time.

➢ Other business

Not covered due to time.

➢ Next Meeting – Tuesday, August 9th – need to reschedule or cancel

Group decided to cancel meeting.

➢ Action Items