

Governance Workgroup Meeting #1
October 29, 2019

Summary of Key Takeaways

- **Key Takeaway #1: The governance workgroup reviewed the workgroup’s charge, scope, problem statement and preliminary hypotheses and recommended the following changes:**
 - *Hypothesis #3. Refine statement to reinforce that the focus should be on reporting progress of encounter data reporting efforts:*
 - *“Establish a trust framework for reporting progress in improving encounter data improvements reporting, with baselines and targets for improvement to achieve, and benchmarking of completeness, timeliness, and accuracy of encounter file submissions”*
 - *Hypothesis #4: to remove specific references to advancing recommendations to government agencies, adjusting the hypothesis to:*
 - *“Support mechanisms for advancing recommendations”*
 - *Hypothesis #5: Clarify that the role of governance isn’t to create incentive programs, rather that governance should enable a framework for how payers across lines of business should establish encounter reporting incentive programs:*
 - *“Establish a framework to develop and align reporting improvement incentive programs that span payers and lines of business”*
 - Follow-up item(s):
 - Manatt to update problem statement and hypotheses

- **Key Takeaway #2: The governance workgroup reviewed the straw model created to describe the key attributes for an ideal encounter data submission governance structure, and recommended the following changes and clarifications:**
 - *Regarding the transparency principle: the workgroup needs to define the intent of “public” reporting.*
 - *Regarding authority, the work group should focus on both the business drivers and existing (or potentially new) regulatory drivers that governance can align with to support its work and enable change. The workgroup acknowledged that there are a complicated set of organizations with governance structures already in place within the encounter data ecosystem. Existing mechanisms must be taken into account as governance recommendations are developed.*
 - *The governance workgroup will need to consider and develop recommendations regarding its role in overseeing standardization and technical assistance programs that may be established to address encounter data reporting barriers.*

- **Key Takeaway #3: The governance workgroup must be clear in its recommendations around the role governance will have in enforcing its policies, and consider business drivers and regulatory regimes that it can align with.**
 - Follow-up item(s):
 - To inform decision making at the next workgroup, Manatt to conduct research on the spectrum of public facing healthcare governance structures (informal to formal – e.g., ICE and IHA) that exist across the state and nation.

Governance Workgroup Meeting #1
October 29, 2019

- **Key Takeaway #4: For alignment purposes, it will be critical for the governance workgroup to have line of site to the recommendations that are being generated within the other encounter data project workgroups.**
 - Follow-up item(s):
 - Manatt to provide the governance workgroup with updates on the recommendations that are being developed in the data standardization and technology and technology assistance workgroups.

- **Key Takeaway #5: There was consensus that all solutions development within the governance workgroup must take into account all stakeholders. It can't be assumed that only providers are burnt out from the administrative burdens of the current encounter data submission process. All solutions that come from this workgroup will need to be focused on driving value across the entire value chain.**

- **Key Takeaway #6: The workgroup agrees that solutions, outputs and recommendations from the governance workgroup should factor in all lines of businesses.**
 - Follow-up item(s):
 - Manatt to build out an updated document that flushes out the details of each agreed upon principle

- **Key Takeaway #7: The governance workgroup reviewed the workgroup's principles and attribute and recommended the following changes:**
 - *Principle #1 – “Participatory”: It needs to be clear what stakeholders will be involved. Since it's going to be proscribed – not everyone can be involved. The language should be adjusted to:*
 - *The language should be adjusted to: “Public and private stakeholders have a voice and are adequately and meaningfully represented.”*

 - *Principle #2 – “Transparent”: Transparency should focus on making the actions, rules and policies that the governance structure creates and follows visible to external stakeholders .*
 - *The language should be adjusted to: “Activities and performance is monitored, decision making processes are visible to the public, and there is clear visibility into how the rules and policies are created.*

 - *Principle #3 – “Accountable”: The group needs to reframe “subject to oversight” to not overstep existing industry oversight structures. Additionally, the language Incorporate elements that include having metrics, targets and reporting of performance.*
 - *The language should be adjusted to: “Conscious effort is made to use benchmarks and targets to report and improve performance and responsiveness to the needs of its stakeholders is a core tenet.”*

 - *Principle #4– “Decision Making”: This principle should be re-worded to reflect how the governance structure makes decisions.*

Governance Workgroup Meeting #1
October 29, 2019

- *The language should be adjusted to: “Rules and decisions are made in accordance with established policies. Actions and decisions are designed in a non-biased manner to ensure stated objectives are met.”*
- *Principle #5– “Alignment”: This principle should be refined to ensure that there is alignment with the business and regulatory needs of all stakeholders.*
 - *The language should be adjusted to: “All rules and decisions must be designed in a non-biased manner, and align with the business needs and regulatory requirements of all stakeholders.”*
- *”Principle #6– “Authority”: The group needs to carefully consider the “enforcement” aspect here, and consider the possibility that governance authority may be best rooted in existing business and regulatory levers.*
 - *The language should be refined as follows: “Governance establishes policies and practices that are designed to ensure compliance and alignment with enforceable business and regulatory rules and requirements.”*
- *”Principle #7– “Responsiveness”: The language should be refined to clarify that governance is in place to respond to the needs of its constituencies.*
 - *The language should be refined as follows: “Governance has processes and feedback mechanisms in place to respond and adapt to the changing needs and expectations of all of its stakeholders.”*
- *”Principle #8– “Effectiveness”: The group recommended that governance should exist to lead changes in practice and through its actions must enable real and lasting improvement in encounter data reporting in California.*
 - *The language should be: “Governance measures its success by its ability to help enable and lead changes in practice by embracing policies, processes, and initiatives that coordinate and makes the best possible use of available resources.”*
 - *”Principle #9– “Sustainable”: No changes to the proposed language*
- Follow-up item(s):
 - Manatt to update governance principles as noted above.

Attendees

Jonah Frohlich, Manatt Health	Stephanie Landrum-Hall, Health Net
Anthony Brown, Manatt Health	Charles Bacchi, California Association of Health Plans (CAHP)
Nathan Nau, California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)	Sarah Summer, California Medical Association (CMA)
Allison Wolpoff, Harder & Co.	Robert Beaudry, California Primary Care Association
Ryan Wintz, California Hospital Association (CHA)	Aaron Goodale, MedPOINT Management



**Governance Workgroup Meeting #1
October 29, 2019**

Jeff Rideout, Integrated Healthcare Association (IHA)	Bill Barcelona, America's Physician Groups (APG)
Shelley Rouillard, California Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC)	Martha Santana-Chin, Health Net