

## **NEMESIS Internal Advisory Board**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**April 12, 2022**

#### Welcome

- No corrections or additions to previous meeting minutes
- ONDCP presentation used NEMESIS Data

#### Discussion: Request to “spot-check” field vendor compliance based on complaints/formal requests

- NEMESIS TAC being used to oversee the vendors data quality, even at the behest of states or other stakeholders’ treads into the market/proprietary aspects of software. Currently there is no process in which this can occur where there wouldn’t be a market impact.
- States/Territories and EMS Agencies need to define their quality of data vs quantity of data; aspects they could consider interface/user experience, metrics, use of collected data.

#### Discussion: Data Quality

- Different aspects of data quality that could be considered
  - I. Exchanging data with other projects/products
  - II. Careful not to use validation rules to force documentation rather than documenting patient care
    - a. Are clinicians being “forced” to enter data?
    - b. Do the validation rules enforce entry but not accuracy?
    - c. Scoring may be taken as punitive?
  - III. Meaningful use of the data – what questions can/need to be answered?
  - IV. Variation within the data could impact quality
  - V. Education available to the field on documentation – how do we get the information out to the field on the importance of documentation
    - a. EMS comparison at the agency level to do peer grading
    - b. Clinical meaningfulness
- There is a need to identify the specific areas (elements) of focus
- NEMSQA approach to quality measures includes peer review
  - I. Measures being met but not documented properly
- Improved education for Clinicians
  - I. Good documentation matters
  - II. Effects of good documentation locally

#### Discussion: Data sharing between EMS and Hospitals; HIE efforts

- eOutcomes group headed by Josh identified 6 use cases
- Awareness about the usefulness of interoperability between EMS and Hospitals needs to be broadened
  - I. NEMESIS partnered with IHE/HL7 in Path to Production

- a. Anticipated two year process with four connect-a-thons, will start late April 2022
- b. They bring representatives that will be exchanging the data and help with the implementation of exchange
- c. The TAC will help to define the problem, define the use case, build and test tools and guides to facilitate exchange and then test the connection

Discussion: Vendor Meetings with Eric Chaney

- Discussion topics of vendor meetings will be summarized at Annual meeting
- Next set of meetings will be to gain the state perspective

Discussion: Update/Revision to the Data Standard

- Defined types of update/revision
  - I. Major – Minor – Build Number – Critical Patch
- Frequency of each type of update/revision – important to consider the following:
  - I. Time frame for each type of update/revision, impact on vendors, impact on states, impact on agencies/clinicians
  - II. Other impacts to consider – reporting, documentation, clinical education requirements, compliance testing, IHE/HIE, billing interfaces, registry interfaces, other downstream effects

Discussion: DEM files

- Consistent questions are put forth that currently cannot be answered with the NEMESIS demographic (DEM) information
  - I. Are there enough clinicians to cover the nation's needs?
  - II. How many ambulances are there in operation across the nation?
- Requested input from the members of the board about how to improve DEM information, understanding, and meaningful use
- What is in-scope for NEMESIS to collect from agencies within the state?
  - I. What does it look like and how will it be sustained?
  - II. Who is responsible for the DEM information agencies or states?
    - a. Who owns the data repository?
    - b. Who should it be shared with, is this FOIA?
  - III. What's the point of building the DEM if no one is going to use it?
  - IV. How do we sustain a current DEM list of agencies?
    - i. The lack of a national identifier is a problem.
    - ii. States are using different ID numbers.
    - iii. Agencies respond to multiple states.
  - V. What is the incentive to the agencies to update? Can it be built into their processes?

Discussion: Operationalizing EMS data

- NEMSQA and NEMESIS performance measures should stay aligned
  - I. Current national standard
  - II. NEMSQA will endorse and harmonize data
  - III. Collaboration opportunity for consistent messaging

Discussion: Frequency of Internal Advisory Board Meetings

- Quarterly is fine for the group

Topics tabled for next meeting

- Additional support needed for implementing v3.5 for states/territories
- Interdependencies and timeframe

Action Items:

- TAC – Data Quality Review – For the IAB review
  - I. Vendor/Agency/State Level – What is going well? What is a struggle?
  - II. Outreach to vendor/agency/state with both kudos and pain points
- IAB – How are you using the data
  - I. IAB Members will send top 5-6 questions in an email
    - a. How is the data being used?
    - b. What is being used to collect the data?
- TAC – Go to AVL and find out what data they are looking for from DEM element information
- IAB – Send an email with what questions about DEM do you think are important, what do you think needs to be clarified within the DEM, what changes may improve DEM compliance and meaningful use of DEM data
- TAC – PowerPoint slide statement on DEM compliance, explain what we are building and WHY, then collaborate with groups who can promote/mandate
- TAC– Consider a data dictionary for the DEM with more explanation about WHY the element is included and what will be done with it
- TAC – review start up procedures to have more DEM explanation and why it is important