



## PMIX Operations Subcommittee

**Date/time:** Tuesday, November 8<sup>th</sup>, 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:
<b>State Representatives:</b>		
California	Lori Rich	Y
Delaware	Jason Slavoski	N
Florida	Erika Marshall	N
Georgia	Vlad Schorstein	N
Kentucky	Heather Kollar	Y
Maine	Jennifer Marlowe	Y
Nebraska	Kevin Borchert	Y
New York	Kassandra Palmer, Alexa Bontempo, Shirley Madewell, Svetlana Jensen	Y
Washington	Eric Grace	Y
<b>Other:</b>		
Bamboo Health	Zohaib Salim	Y
IJIS	Robert May, Ron Larsen	Y
Logicoy	Fred Aabedi	N
NABP	Danna Droz	Y
NIC	Christie Frick, Kelly Parker	N
OpiSafe	Chris Ennis	N
Scriptulate	Neil Chatterlee, MD	N
Tetrus	Sanjay Ungarala	N
<b>Invited Guests</b>		
BizTek	Denise Robertson	N
<b>Committee Support:</b>		
CDC	Wes Sargent	N
ONC	Carmen Smiley	N
PDMP TTAC	Patrick Knue, Don Vogt	Y

## Conference Call Agenda/Minutes

### ➤ Roll Call

Quorum establish

### ➤ Approval of Minutes from 10-11-2022

Motion made by Shirley Madewell (NY); seconded by Ron Larsen (IJS). Unanimously approved.

### ➤ Patient Matching Workgroup

Kevin Borchert (NE) mentioned that the workgroup did not meet this month. No information since last month to provide. He added that there is a AHIMA workgroup that will discuss patient matching. He and Carmen Smiley (ONC) will participate in this workgroup.

### ➤ 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
- **Define Standardize** terminology ~~across hubs~~ **in PMIX**
- **Standardize Accommodate** 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~~
- ~~‘Require’ minimum security standards are met~~

Vote to send to Executive Committee

Kevin Borchert (NE) asked if there were any additional discussions needed on above list of items. Shirley Madewell (NY) stated that there are differences among the PDMPs and it may be difficult for some to implement select standards; i.e., establishing security standards – those are very state-centric; standardized terminology and role mapping. Kevin Borchert (NE) believes that prior to standards being implemented those issues could be resolved and PDMPs may need to consider implementing new methods. Shirley Madewell (NY) felt it would be a beneficial exercise to identify the security level currently in place with the PDMPs. Patrick Knue (TTAC) mentioned that the above items are for standards to be established for the current and future hubs for interoperability and may not be that impactful on individual PDMPs. Ron Larsen (IJIS) mentioned that hubs are transmitting encrypted PII and PHI data which is decrypted at the end points. Danna Droz (NABP) stated that each PDMP/state has their own established security standards. Alexa Bontempo (NY) had concerns that ‘standardize role mapping across states/hubs’ item could be problematic for the PDMPs. There are variations among the laws defining different user roles. Danna Droz (NABP) suggested changing the wording to ‘accommodate’ that would resolve this issue. The subcommittee approved change. Don Vogt (TTAC) recommended changing ‘standardize terminology across hubs’ to ‘define terminology in PMIX’. The subcommittee approved the change. The subcommittee decided to remove the last two bullets for now in order to discuss in more detail. The subcommittee decided to remove ‘establish minimum time frame for system availability for hubs’ since no future hub. Motion to approve the above revised list to be sent to the Executive Committee for further review was made by Eric Grace (WA); seconded by Shirley Madewell (NY). Unanimously approved.

- 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 (i.e., request to response time, request to display time, number of queries, number of queries by user role)
  - Review and comparison of state-to-state sharing rules (start discussion at next meeting)
  - User/Provider authorization
  - User authentication (DEA, NPI, or state license) and validation
  - 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
- Appropriate security to prevent, detect, and remediate cyberattacks
- PDMP have separate access controls for intrastate users, interstate users, and integrated users

### Vote to send to Executive Committee

Kevin Borchert (NE) asked if there were any additional discussions needed on above list of items. Shirley Madewell (NY) recommended adding examples for the 'monitoring of transaction metrics'. She questioned 'review and comparison of state-to-state sharing rules' as appropriate for this goal. Due to time, discussion on this goal will continue at the December meeting.

### ➤ Other business

Not covered due to time

### ➤ Next Meeting – Tuesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>

### ➤ Action Items