

Contract Providers Transition Team (CPTT) Planning Meeting

Minutes of the January 20, 2009 Meeting

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
Welcome	Karen welcomed the participants and reviewed the agenda.	
Announcements	<p>The California Institute for Mental Health (CIMH) Ninth Annual National Information Management Conference and Exposition Conference brochure has been posted on the CPTP website. The dates of the conference are April 22-23, 2009.</p> <p>The seven vendors providing product demonstrations at the conference are currently EDI certified or in the process of becoming EDI certified with various contract agencies in the County. Several agencies in the County are doing presentations at the conference.</p> <p>The early registration date is March 31, 2009.</p>	<p>CIMH Brochure link:</p> <p>http://elearning.networkofcare.org/cimh/content/IM0809_PrelimPrgm_v1.23.09.pdf</p>
MHSA Technological Plan Update (Phase 1)	<p>Mr. Robert Greenless provided an update on the MHSA Technological Plan. The MHSA Technological Plan was reviewed and accepted in July 2008. The Plan was slated to be on the Board of Supervisor's (BOS) agenda on January 13, 2009. However, due to the absence of one of the senior Health Deputies and questions raised by the First District, the Plan will be rescheduled to the BOS agenda for February 3, 2009. (Note: BOS approved the plan on February 3).</p> <p>If the Plan is approved by the BOS on February 3, the next step is to forward the plan to the State Department of Mental Health (DMH). The State DMH has estimated a sixty-day (60) turnaround period to complete their review.</p> <p>Pending approval by State DMH, the funds are released through another State agency. Based on the initial MHSA Technological plans submitted by other Counties such as San Mateo County, there is a delay from the DMH plan approval date to the distribution of funds of up to five months. Based on these results, there will be no distribution of MHSA IT funds in FY 08/09.</p> <p>In the Board letter for the MHSA Plan, CIOB requested four additional positions to support the contract provider project proposal process. The staff would setup and monitor all contract agency MHSA IT projects from initial project approval through implementation and project closeout. CIOB did consider retaining contract employees in the</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
	interim but would prefer to have county employees.	
MHSA Technological Planning Process (Phase 2)	<p>The State released an additional \$31 million in MHSA IT funds in August 2008. The use of these funds must be determined through a second planning process and the preparation of a second MHSA Technological Plan (Phase 2).</p> <p>Mr. Greenless suggested an approach to develop and submit the Phase 2 plan using a streamlined process. The Phase 2 plan package would propose that the same six projects in the original plan be continued using the same 70/30 split of MHSA funds. It would be preferable to submit the Phase 2 plan to the State as soon as possible. DMH has requested delegated authority to amend the original MHSA IT plan based on an increase in MHSA funds.</p> <p>Once the additional funding is secure, DMH, CIOB and the contract agencies can work out the details regarding the funding allocation for each agency.</p> <p>The contract agencies were receptive to this approach in light of the continuing State budget crisis.</p>	
State DMH Electronic Signature Letter No. 08-10	<p>The State DMH released Letter No. 08-10 on December 4, 2008 regarding Electronic Signatures and Electronically Signed Records. The announcement included an Electronic Signature Agreement example to be completed by an individual and an Electronic Signature Certification example to be signed by the County mental health director.</p> <p>Mr. Greenless is not comfortable with the language in the Electronic Signature Certification example since the County cannot certify that the electronic signatures affixed to the electronic mental health records meet or exceed all of the standards, security, regulations and laws for every computer system outside of the County DMH system. A revision of this certification example will be sent to the State DMH.</p> <p>Mr. Greenless also suggested that the County should not maintain the individual Electronic Signature forms for the contract agencies. These forms should be maintained at each agency.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the State Auditors should be given a separate security role to allow read only access to electronic health records systems. There is also no need for physical access to these systems.</p>	<p>State DMH Letter link: http://www.dmh.ca.gov/DMHDocs/docs/Letters08/08-10.pdf</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
<p>State DMH Budget Update/Impact</p>	<p>According to Mr. Greenless, he does not have any clear answer on the State budget situation and the impact on the MHSA IT dollars. MHSA IT dollars that have been allocated should be secure. The concern is for MHSA IT dollars released through the second allocation.</p> <p>Mr. Greenless suggested that the agencies and DMH should be careful to plan projects so as not to get too far ahead of ourselves in light of the State budget crisis.</p> <p>He will continue to monitor the State budget for updates and provide information.</p>	
<p>Open Discussion by Topic</p>	<p>New Funding Agreement</p> <p>CIOB staff and DMH contracts are meeting weekly to prepare the new Funding Agreement. There has been significant progress over the last two months.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the draft Funding Agreement will be ready for internal DMH review by the end of January. The internal DMH review should be completed in February.</p> <p>The Funding Agreement will then be sent out for review by the County CIO, CEO, Risk Management and County Counsel. The contract providers requested a review of the sample agreement prior to finalizing the content. Mr. Greenless agreed to distribute the sample agreement to the CPTP Workgroup members in February.</p> <p>A second Board letter will be prepared for the new Funding Agreement as part of the package for both internal and external review. The Board letter will request delegated authority to enter into negotiations to execute funding agreements similar to the sample agreement.</p> <p>Q: Is the 20% start-up fund a part of the agreement?</p> <p>A: Yes, there is contract language to describe this provision.</p> <p>Q: Based on the time required for BOS approval, is there a risk that the funding agreement will not be approved and could delay starting the approved MHSA IT projects?</p> <p>A: The agreement is a hybrid of the Legal Entity agreement and the Consulting Agreement with a few new provisions. This should enable approval in a timely manner pending review by County Counsel.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
	<p>Q: Will the agencies need a new agreement when the additional funding in Phase 2 becomes available?</p> <p>A: The Board Letter is requesting delegated authority to increase the total contract amount by 20% without an amendment. If the additional funding allocation exceeds 20% of the total contract amount, we will need to prepare an amendment and submit it to the BOS.</p> <p>Electronic Signatures</p> <p>Q: Are we allowed to use e-signatures now?</p> <p>A: Some agencies are already using e-signatures and have been audited by the State. It is okay to use e-signatures as long as the agency complies with the State guidelines as stated in DMH Letter No. 08-10.</p> <p>Q: What do we need prepare for the implementation of e-signatures?</p> <p>A: Make sure that you follow the State guidelines as stated in DMH Letter No. 08-10.</p> <p>Q: Are the agencies going to get a new letter from the State with updated information based on any concerns from the County?</p> <p>A: No, this is the letter for the State but you might get a letter from DMH stating how the County plans to implement the State electronic signature policy.</p> <p>Q: Do you have the employee version of this?</p> <p>A: There is the individual Electronic Signature Agreement example form with the State DMH letter. This form documents the agreement with the individual regarding electronic signatures.</p> <p>IBHIS</p> <p>Q: What is the status of IBHIS RFP?</p> <p>A: Proposal responses are due on February 26, 2009.</p> <p>Q: What is the timeline for EDI Certification with IBHIS?</p> <p>A: By the end of 2009, we plan to select the IBHIS vendor. Based on this timeline, we anticipate implementation of IBHIS in June 2011. One approach in</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
	<p>the interim, may be to setup the Integrated System (IS) as a contract provider to submit EDI transactions to IBHIS. The contract agencies would continue to send EDI transactions directly to the IS until all agencies were certified on IBHIS. IBHIS would forward the EDI transactions to the State. The EDI Certification and implementation approach has not been determined.</p> <p>Q: Would it be possible to share common libraries such as treatment libraries with IBHIS and DMH if the County plans to purchase them? This would eliminate the need for each agency to purchase their own standard libraries.</p> <p>A: We do not have a clear answer on this now. We will need to review the responses to the IBHIS RFP.</p> <p>Project Proposal Process</p> <p>Q: We have already submitted our MHPA IT project proposal, however, due to the delay in BOS approval and projected delay in the State funding process, our proposal schedule and budget summary are no longer accurate. Should we submit a revised proposal?</p> <p>A: We will require a revised timeline and budget, however, we would recommend waiting to resubmit the revised proposal until after BOS approval but prior to execution of the funding agreement. We will work with each agency to ensure that their proposals are revised, if needed.</p> <p>Q: What is the status of the MHPA IT proposals that have already been submitted? Will they be reviewed and approved?</p> <p>A: The staff to review and approve these proposals are included in the MHPA IT plan. We do not have staff to approve these proposals until the new MHPA IT funds. In the interim, CPTP staff are reviewing the proposals to ensure all required proposal documents are received with the package.</p> <p>Q: Have you received any proposals from the agencies?</p> <p>A: Yes we did receive three proposals. (Seven proposals received as of the date of these minutes)</p> <p>Q: Should we wait for IBHIS to submit our proposals?</p> <p>A: You do not have to wait, you can submit them at any time. Each proposal will be reviewed for required documents.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
	<p>Rendering Provider Forms</p> <p>Q: We are struggling to get new rendering providers into the IS? What is being done to reduce the backlog.</p> <p>A: DMH has had trouble hiring and retaining new staff to help with this problem. CIOB is working on a project to replace the rendering provider form with an electronic web-based fillable form that can be submitted directly into the IS. The form would include online edits to ensure that all required information is submitted.</p> <p>State Request for Information (RFI)</p> <p>Q: What is the status of the State DMH Request for Information (RFI) to identify behavioral health vendors and solutions?</p> <p>A: We will send an e-mail to you that includes all the details once we receive them. (Email sent on January 20, 2009 to CPTP Workgroup members with the results of the RFI . See link for more information)</p> <p>State Short-Doyle Phase II Initiative</p> <p>Mr. Robert Greenless informed the group of the State Short-Doyle Phase II Initiative to replace the current EDI translator by June 1, 2009. The contract on the current translator expires on July 1, 2009. County DMH has expressed concerns via the California Mental Health Directors Association (CMHDA) that this is not a realistic time line.</p> <p>Final specifications for the EDI transactions and any new edits are still pending from the State.</p> <p>The State has not provided a robust test environment with live production data. There is no full round trip testing capability.</p> <p>The State has not addressed the need for real-time claim processing which was the original plan for HIPAA EDI transactions. There may be an impact on the claims processing if these issues are not resolved.</p> <p>Q: Will there be a slow down in the turnaround for Medi-Cal claims?</p>	<p>State RFI link:</p> <p>http://www.dmh.ca.gov/Prop_63/MHSA/Technology/RFI.asp.</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Item
	<p>A: There may be but we cannot confirm this yet.</p> <p>Q: Will IBHIS provide a full EDI certification test environment?</p> <p>A: We do not know, however, the current IS does test against a full production copy of the IS data. There is a limitation at the State since the State does not return the claim remittance advice (HIPAA 835) transaction to provide a full round trip test for claims processing. The testing with the State is a one-way test.</p> <p>Statewide Clinical Content Standards</p> <p>Mr. Greenless discussed an initiative directed by Tom Trabin and a working group to develop standardized clinical content for treatment plans and other clinical documentation to be used by all Counties within the State. This initiative would greatly aid in the sharing of clinical data across all agencies.</p> <p>Behavioral Health Standards Update</p> <p>Mr. Greenless indicated some progress on the development of behavioral health care criteria from both the Certification Commission for Healthcare Information Technology (CCHIT) and Health Level 7 (HL7).</p> <p>The CCHIT Behavioral Workgroup plans to release the draft Behavioral Health certification criteria in August 2009. The draft criteria, once finalized, will be used to certify behavioral health software systems.</p> <p>HL7 released the Behavioral Health Functional Profile on December 10, 2008. This profile is a subset of the full EHR System Functional Model released in 2007.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the following links:</p> <p>http://www.hl7.org/ or http://www.cchit.org/</p>	
Next Meeting	February 17, 2009 10:00-Noon at CIOB Headquarters – 695 S. Vermont Ave. Room 713 Los Angeles , CA 90005	