

**Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos,
Creating Interoperable Information Systems**

Panelists:

Tammy White

David Jenkins

Ron Ozga

William E. Travis

Please note: The following is a direct transcription and has not been edited.

Tammy White: Good morning everyone. Thank you very much for coming. We are going to get started because we've got sessions back to back here. So let's get going. David will go through some of the logistics as we go along but let me just quickly do a brief introduction my name is Tammy White. I'm a data analyst with the data team at the Children's Bureau. I have the pleasure of having a panel of experts here with me. To my right is Bill Travis, he is the Deputy Commissioner and Chief Information Officer for the division of Information Technology for the New York State Office of Children and Family Services. Next to him is Mr. Ron Ozga, he is the Information Technology Director, under the Governor's office of Information Technology for the Colorado Department of Human Services. And at the end of the table is Mr. David Jenkins, he is our Director of the Information Resources Management Division within the office of Information Services with the administration for Children and Families. And we will go ahead and get started. Please feel free to ask questions along the way, the presenters are all prepared to answer whatever questions you have. We will keep to a fairly tight timeframe. We go until 10:30. So please feel free. Thanks.

David: Great. Oops, let me check this part out, we are clear now, you can hear. One of the things is that that Tammy didn't mention, we have a checklist in terms of who is going to present and who is going to moderate, I'm going to really kick off. So if any challenges arise please locate stuff and seek assistance and I'm confronted with this challenges. Maybe challenges, I have is actually implementing national architecture as well as a national standard for information exchanges in people and services. And working on confidentiality and privacy and the total federal staff that supporting this and standing in front of you right now. So there is a challenge.

The three things, I really want to talk about today, one is, the work we are doing to develop a concept of our national architecture. And second is how we can exchange information in today's world and to create better interoperability to get information down to where the service providers need and dealing with the legacy systems in the process of doing that. And the third thing is, about confidentiality and privacy. You know, it's good to have an architect, he is going to have a target, it's good to be able to exchange information with that but we if we don't overcome some of the hurdles and some of the challenges associated with sharing information that consider sensitive and then all the work is for none. We might well just have a vision and just redundantly. So part of the work we are going to talk about today will deal with confidentiality and privacy.

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

We started in ACF with the new administration and our leadership came in, Carmen Nazario and determined that the way we are doing business just simply isn't working. We've got program offices with an ACF in a stove pipe. They don't talk to each other. They basically are isolated. They are autonomous. They don't work well together. We need to make a change. And Carmen says the only thing we need to be able to do in order to make this change is get people to adopt a new way of printing. So we gave rise to this concept of Human Services 2.0. And with this underpinnings of that is the exchange of information how do we make it possible and flexible for information from various silos to get to the people who need to use that. How do we get the information to improve ourselves as an organization? So we are not dealing with an individual family or community in a very narrow sense. The child is more than child support or child welfare. The child in the family is more than TANF. Smaller things and bright things will present themselves when people are in need. We are trying to use this as a concept to take a lot more holistic view of the services that we actually provide.

Carmen brought the challenge to ACF, David Hansell, Carmen actually had departed, she had some health issues, she need to deal with her family and she departed, David Hansell came in from New York. And David embraced this particular concept. And so we began moving the human services concept internally as well as externally in terms of technical enabler and a technical enhancement. So challenge people to think of this differently. And then David left. And George Sheldon from Florida came in.

Now watching we are not wearing out our leadership, it's just the nature of the business. People will come and grab these jobs will do it. But the part of the challenge is, is that we can bring people on board, even leadership as we go. So managing up in this particular area as proven to be that George Sheldon is just as passionate about this as were Carmen and David were. So his views, and his quote is very, this is David, George's quote is even more as the same. He says that this maybe the single most important thing that ever come out of ACF. So it's a very dramatic statement of support that we are dealing with right now.

So definition we have, what interoperability is, it's basically a technical term but we are applying this technical term into organization structure, into the exchange of information. So we are trying to get this down simply. Ultimately what this means is just sharing information. So that we've got common share and this type of things we deal with that. Then we are going to meet success with that. Technology can be used to leverage that but ultimately it's a cultural issue that we deal with the terms of this interoperability.

For the strategic initiatives that we have really important of this, we want to be able to create this target, the 2B vision about how information could be shared at the local level where it needs to be shared. Then this vision is -- vision that we give it a silo, we get rid of them stove pipes that states our faced with because of their own funding streams. Federal funding streams as I'm going to give you money to build a child welfare system or a child support system or a TANF system or a child care system. And I'm going to give you fully money to do that, need to contribute some of your own but when they build a silo like that all the information could be useful so others is earmarked or marked

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

off or blocked off for access for the others in that. So what we are trying to do is, let's get rid of the silo concept, let's actually move to a better concept of shared services and shared components. And if we can do that we can actually save money and improve the services. So those are the targets that are dealing with. There is a little known, here is the data I used. We spend \$62 billion a year on information systems in the States, for operations, maintenance development and other support issues, of \$62 billion.

If we can get rid of the silos we can start doing shared services and shared parts, I guarantee we can save half of that. Right now we are faced with budget difficulties nationally as well as year budget difficulties in states where the funding streams and the revenues are not what they used to be. So coming up with your share of building something is even more difficult than it was in the past. So what we are looking for is, how can we be smart of our future IT and do in a such way that we can actually create the shared services and shared components.

So the architecture right now is referred to as NICEA and is a concept or taking with the best practices that we see in the states and they are developing this – architectural developments and pilots to show that the architecture is effective.

We are also the domain store, NIEM, it's National Information Exchange Model and with this is actually staging information where it's needed, it's not creating this while taxonomy of data elements into that its actually if you are exchanging information that's given exchange package together the people can agree on and that's how you would exchange that. If you think about services that if you are a social worker or a worker that you need information so that you block the hall or talking to desk, we exchange information and then you can actually have better information to take a decision. Well, that's holding in efficient if we have to do that for 1000 cases. So what we are looking for is, highly formalize this, highly institutionalize this, I really put something in place where we can have information exchange packets and have access to that.

The other thing we are doing is putting our tool kits of various areas so that the States Human Services can engage in a conversation with State Health Services in order to take advantage of what we care, I will get into that a little later.

Now, the Formal Care Act very recently was passed by congress and it mandates the states build and information exchange mandates they build eligibility determination component and a verified information by the eligibility component. Domicile income family areas associated with that. And they said in a law that if you build those make sure that they are used by particular services. So for us this is ideal for a pilot or a project exactly what want be able to do, shared service, shared component, build this eligibility component and let the other pin services use that for their eligibility and determination.

So systems going to exist they can get that information back to their ticker system use this one and the whole area associated with this is how it's funded. So we put together a tool kit and said that here is the information that you need, congress has passed its legislation as human services, and White House has passed an MLC and it will be more

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

flexible and whatever we need to be able to do that flexibility yes its part of the token we have here. Letters from ACS, CMS, *[indiscernible]* *[00:10:07]* indicating that they supporting the idea of shared services and shared components. So you are using the services in states if they can get to the table to talk to health folks as they build this eligibility components, they can actually influence the direction of the *[indiscernible]* *[00:10:22]*.

Now the last item we have on the list is called referred to as a cost allocation exception. The government building existent as put in place 887 as a rule and this is a cost allocation required. So that child welfare wants to build something and once they let other people use that like TANF or SNAP, then they have to go through the process of getting the TANF people and the SNAP people to read, they are going to pay their share to build this. Well, how do you get into an effective model if you can get people to agree with and the funding streams definitely are silos just as large. This waiver which was just recently realized by OMB says for this one thing for the cost out for the eligibility determination component, CMS will pay 90% to get that built. 90% to get that built as if nothing is there, so the infrastructure to support this, the analytics, all the tools associated with making that an effective implementation is paid 90% by CMS, 10% by the state. And if human services wants to use it once that part is built their only cost, whatever incremental cost it is, they join in that particular time. So if they have to alter it to bring in tandems slightly or alter to bring in a child welfare determination or a SNAP determination. That cost is already there at that particular time and much and much reduced.

OMB has been very specific in terms of this waiver that its only to work the eligibility determination portion. That's it. Once the deadline to get those information passes the waiver ends. There are also mandating that as we inform in this area we have to be vigilant to make sure that people who are using this opportunity or not abusing at the same time. So that building all their system on CMS fund. They are only building this one component in such a way that others can use that. But it's a great starting point, if you start to think about what's needed for that it's a great starting point to get in place and then modify our systems to be services oriented approach with that.

There are seven conditions that CMS had published in order to get the funding, of the seven we have to use line-up and the architecture, we have to use, we have to do sharing, we have to have fourth additions and last one is you must ensure seamless coordination and variation exchange human service programs. So what they are looking for is that states are going to use this type and show how you are going well in services.

So for our project in terms of the architecture we actually took a look at NIEM which is the framework for Medicaid Information Technology *[indiscernible]* *[00:13:19]* 7 years on. They have sufficient coverage of functions that actually mirror and are duplicative of functions that we are finding with the services. So our view of this is that there are good practices occurring in the states, those are good architecture it's already out there, let's align that human services architecture what already exists. There are differences like differences, Medicaid deal with providers and human services deal with people. We

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

basically made adjustments of that type but there is a good alignment associated with that. There is a global architecture that is in the same mold services oriented architecture shared services, shared component. It's our intent as we recall here, what I can see in vision as evolved as an intergovernmental architecture and just getting rid of this concept of this and this and this and this to have a logical IT implementation where information can reach, where we can share the points of shared services across within a state and actually across state wide. There are number of states that are actually binding it together now because of the revenue issues since we have got and each maybe building some component that the other can share with them. So there are some good outcomes that we are seeing sort to develop.

Architecture is an architecture, we have architecture of house, you got floor plans, you got elevations, you got wiring, you got plumbing, you got all these different views of the building itself and this is how we have all these different views in terms of interoperability architecture, information architecture. Only two of these you see are technical. Rest of them really business and project oriented how to get things done.

Business drives this. Technology enables the business to be able to do this but we are using the business to drive this to the element we want. So the key concepts as you can see you it's here before we try to deal with are moving towards a future cloud computing is a definite possibility for that. And how do you cost to allocate that?

There are two projects that are ongoing right now, two work groups in OMB, one is dealing with how do we deal with IT cost allocation of future especially the if you are on cloud where you can virtualize anything and you can share that hence in a logical way, I mean, cost allocator. The second one that you are looking at is, how do we deal with evaluations or audits and if I heard we continue to look within a presentation was this morning is dealing with the whole concept of evaluation, OMB is taking a look at the way we do business is that we go out there, we count lines of code, we count the allocation what cost those lines of coding come, assets and service line at least they say, what we say maybe it's not the best way to do that. Maybe its more effective if we take a look at what the outcome is of what's being produced and what's the main point?

Have we improved the conditions of the community, have we improved the conditions of a family or an individual how many, how effective was that. And who would be thinking real hard look at audit along that particular line. The other area that I want to talk about was named natural architecture not national information exchange and one quick example of that is, how many -- when you are stopped by a policeman on a highway or a road?

A: I wasn't just me.

A: Me too.

David: Okay. They may pulled you off your ride and what they do is actually put a couple of things, around illustrations about your arrest. What they do with that they actually go back and use mean exchange to that information and sent that to a database in

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

Phoenix, Arizona. And the Phoenix, Arizona database has all kinds of worry information from all 50 states and jurisdiction. And so that if you are wanted for something in a different jurisdiction that officer will know that. And it wasn't that way for a long period of time, if start taking look at what happened in Oklahoma and everything, people got away because there was no way to track them actually information exchange, take that information went back, more information comes back and its helpful.

So our very simple basis NIEM is that type of exchange, so what is it that is occurring in local jurisdictions where one area of services actually needs information from another area of services. And what is a normal type of exchange that we can actually accommodate. And then codify that into a package these are the elements we need for this, it's the onus we need to get and these people say this is the onus I need to get from you in order to get that to you. So very simple type of things we deal with that.

So for this domain we are rolling our community ventures to help govern the domain we are involving community interest to help develop those exchanges that can be standard, standardized. New York City is advancing in this particular area, they took nine legacy systems stoke pipe and actually used NIEM to pull information using a model of indexing and pull information on a single individual that appears on the screen with other service work and that service worker then as all the access to the documents to the information about that individual that's within all this context of data. They then can make a good decision with that and when we are finished they go on the next well that disappears so there is no worry about how is this information stored everything, there is ownership issues it remains with that, it just basically using that to make a decision and moving on to the next level.

So HHS, Health and Human Services brought into NIEM, we are the third partner in that online security, justice, health and human services, so health and human services effectively bought a human services domain and a health domain. Owen runs the health NIEM domain and ACF is running the human services domain.

When we take a look at it how scope of this human services domain, if you take a look, this is something like a program view of that. So among these things are our information that would be useful across and between and circling small area in the inside of that because actually work is being done by ACF with a separate domain called family, youth family, youth services domain, children youth and families domain and its basically were courts and social services interact. So what the exchanging information the court will need what is the information that we would need from the court on certain things we have actually effectively making those exchanges. So work is being done in a hurry but there is a whole universe now that's open to us to begin pursuing logical exchanges of that. And that's limited to just this domain, what are exchanges that maybe necessary between this domain and health. Between this domain and law enforcement or courts or emergency preparedness those are the other areas that are associated with that.

The other area I cleared to talk about was the idea of confidentiality privacy. Now without having some rational approach what we are seeing, what we have seen and what

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

you have seen actually is that people will take information, belongs they are going to share it. I'm worried about sharing it, maybe some liability associated with it, if I give you some information something happens, what we are trying to do in terms of this confidential and privacy is get down to what is the legal areas and say under federal statues and jurisdiction, what are the legal areas that people can rely on to effectively exchange information, what's permissible in those areas. So where are allowed to do this, what is it about hip-hop that maybe may require a human services approach to some type of standard for information technology hip-hop basically doesn't say that I can't hear you, he says I'm going to share this and I'm going to share with this group of people, this group of people and this group of people all health that's what they say, they sign it every time. So the consequent consent along this line and actually is making part of moving forward, we are able to share information of logical bases so somebody wants their services, I can set what my information be shared among those people and help provide that.

The idea also in terms of confidentiality, we are not saying that once you do that thing as a full blown, you get access to everything. The concept is when you are driving because of this traffic, you are driving all those stocks up and then you try to draw restructuring as well. We are trying to put this confidentiality privacy in that particular line, get to this particular point, determine what you would be able to go and move forward with that.

The concept of need to know, and minimum necessary it's a standard, however, one of the inhibitions that we see is with that concept to NIEM to know, I was working with one of Joe, at NIEM conference and he came up with a beautiful quote, you need to know, actually an inhibitor who are sharing information. That ought to be that it would be morally correct for people to share the information where somebody is going to benefit, where its going to help somebody share that information.

So we are going to develop a tool like ACF along the same line that we developed that interoperability tool kit in this tool kit we will have all the federal statues related to privacy, confidentiality, you will have models for information sharing and states and do that today. We talked about how New York City did it. Florida has done in a big way. We have jurisdictions all those various parts of the countries in terms of best practices that we are seeing with that. We will give examples of that, case studies of that but you can use, the people can use in their states to help develop that concept of trust so that information could be shared with us.

I want to turn it over to Bill. Any questions really quickly before, yes ma'am.

Q: The question about the...

David: Well, could you step in the mic?

Tammy White: Yes, I was going to say just to remind everyone this is being recorded – audio recorded so please if you can just speak clearly into the microphone and just for people who aren't aware of that. Thank you.

**Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos,
Creating Interoperable Information Systems**

Q: The question...

Tammy White: Is that on? Try it again, here you go.

Q: Okay. This is a question in confirmation of what I've heard I think so on the Affordable Care Act, the 90% funding that states will receive they can use it to build functionality that in the future can interface with – for example the SACWIS system is that what you are saying?

David: It is, but what gets build, I mean, the funding is only particular to the eligibility component.

Q: Okay. You can see...

David: That's I mean is a very narrow exception in terms of this waivers, so it's allowing the state to built this by 2014 after built that but no cost allocation for that specific component.

Q: Okay, great. That's helpful.

David: I mean, there is a lot we can gain.

Q: Yes. Thank you.

Q: Maybe I'm jumping the gun, I've one quick question and then aim more complex question. The first question is, when do you think that confidentiality tool kit will be ready?

David: Well, we are targeting this fall to have that release. So that was an ease answer, you already could challenge that.

Q: The human factor dealing with agencies I have been standing on the table tops dancing with my hair on fire talking about this issue within my state, however, people walk away because it sounds too complicated, there is too much politics involved, too many egos, too many years of certain kinds of siloed practice maybe that leads into the next speaker but...

David: And it may, I agree with you. And what we are dealing with this, that's what I was talking about earlier, it's basically a cultural issue in reality. What is about the confines of certain program or state or organizational type of things in terms of what they do. I want to tell you, I wasn't talking couple of years back. I would hope to go to Colorado because I know they are doing similar type of work. There was a group of people that actually had been in ranks together now rose to leadership and there is this quality of sharing that was just phenomenal. So with that particular culture they were willing to figure out what is necessary more than interesting happens. So we've got an

**Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos,
Creating Interoperable Information Systems**

examples of that, and also examples of just in the opt office where everything is held tightly and this is power *[overlapping conversation] [00:26:01]*. So there are things that you have to overcome together. I think this is a personal interview, in any social moment you got 20% on this side, and 20% on this side, you got this vast middle that you find shift. I think we can shift by getting our 20% there is more even in this particular direction among the states. Then you got some movement going into that it comes in between let's say almost inevitable that people say okay they are doing, they will be doing, *[indiscernible] [00:26:31]*. That's the whole thing or anything else. Bill?

Bill: Thank you, David. I would like to speak to the barriers ahead for a couple moments clearly they are cultural barriers, we have financial barriers, we have technical barriers...

Tammy White: Bill, can you pull the microphone up, just to make sure you are recorded.

Bill: Can you hear me?

Tammy White: Perfect. Thank you.

Bill: So what I would like to address barriers in a second here. David laid the groundwork for this conversation. David has given us the 50,000 foot view of what's occurring in the interoperability space. We are very, very excited about the foundation work that's being conducted at the federal level. You take a look at why we need interoperability in human services space, the foundations that David laid are going to allow us to affect better outcomes for families and children. At the end of the day that's our business. I'm the CIO of New York State Office of Children and Family Services, my focus is on families and children and how do I provide frontline gauge workers with the information that they need right now to make better decisions for kids and families. At the end of the day that's what we know about.

That 75% yield seem to be about something a little bit different in terms of the business driver, what I heard during the opening *[indiscernible] [00:28:12]* service station here with 75% of the folks in the audience were evaluators and work program design people. But I'll bet a lot of you folks came up from the ranks but some of the folks have front line experience that's what I find even on the tactical side a lot of the folks have experience coming off the line and you that with that data redundancy you know that we have problems with our information quality, you know that it cost too much money to be able to continuously have together this information, so given the objectives that I heard like a half an hour ago improving the child welfare evidence-based, strengthening the evaluation planning process better dissemination of information and better collaboration. I will tell you they couldn't have set this up any better for this conversation here today. As we begin to now take a look at what's required, what that I do here.

[Overlapping conversation] [00:29:29]

Bill: I will be very careful from now. I will be very careful because I don't want to ruin this...

**Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos,
Creating Interoperable Information Systems**

A: Stand away from them.

Bill: So what we do now in New York state is the very stove pipe approach that David referred to. Each agency as its own system and gather information what they take and do as they look for what the requirement is from a program evaluation perspective as it relates to that particular SACWIS.

So, again this puts us in a position where we really have taken a look and take a step back and ask ourselves what do we doing with this data, what's the business value of the data, what are the common factors of this data. And how do we begin to take a look at an interoperable solution that provides value for the Front-Line folks and provides value for you folks and you begin to think a critical view of these programs, I know that when I work with our planning program evaluation folks they have their own strategies for interoperability because they need together information from Juvenile Justice, they need to be able to gather information from child care, they need to be able to gather information from child welfare and meet those associations occur today.

And the toolsets quite frankly things like SPSS and using basic spreadsheets are pretty fundamental rudimentary and there is opportunities I think to provide significant value in the evaluation area through interoperability. So, we need to figure out what the roadmap is going to look like. In my state we want a centralized state central registry for child abuse calls, the case is opened in our SACWIS system there is an opportunity to do some clearances and some reviews of information that has occurred in the child welfare space historically. The ability to use that information as it relates to Juvenile Justice is also available but it's again fundamental.

We use a common database with common identifiers well that's about close as it goes. So, after we take this, this call we determine whether or not we should forward it on to our counties, in New York State where a state supervisor locally administered looks like Colorado and some of the – at least 12 of us said that you did it this way. So, our investigators are at the county level, they use our SACWIS system to support their investigation requirements and then ultimately if a case is opened use the SACWIS as the data repository. So, that's how we do our business in New York State. So, if you take a look at that process I mean it's really a total silo in terms of child welfare. We need an opportunity to be able to understand how that family has interacted with the other human services programs and agencies in our state.

Present the scale now we take thousand calls a day its 360,000 calls a year with 60,000 are ultimately indicated. So, there is 300,000 calls that are not indicated that perhaps if we had better information upfront we might be able to focus our investigator resources a little bit better under 60,000 a year. So, we talked a little bit about what disadvantages we have through our caseworkers. A little bit about the advantages in terms of a holistic view in terms of where we all at the state level and at the federal level and at the county level are under significant financial pressures and some of the drivers from NIEM now to

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

lower the long-term cost of government, I'll talk a little bit about our new governor's focus but that's clearly right now one of the business drivers.

So, as in many states we have a number of Silo Systems and the number – these systems were initially funded by separate Federal grants. I can remember back in the – I think the – that's initially called as Famous.

David: Yes.

Bill: Back then the *[indiscernible]* [00:34.46] predecessors, I remember negotiating with our Federal partners, the cost allocation or daily allowance in integrated data base where we had Medicaid, Food Stamps and what we call homework that we call casual systems. And I'll tell you it was like we have rock in bizarre, it really was, this was like new ground in the late 70s and early 80s. And they had to get all three partners together and we finally hammered this out, well, I just – I just think of this now at the Federal level this would be like even like being on a steroids trying to negotiate this amongst all the agency so I'm so encouraged by the A87 relief that David spoke to. It is such an opportunity now for us to be able to provide our caseworkers with a view of that family as they're interacting with our various systems in real-time.

So, you can understand the constraints, you can understand the pressures and you can understand whether or not the interventions are going to leave with desired outcomes. So, its' going to position us to better understand that.

One of the challenges that we have here is that even at the state level many of these agencies don't speak to one and other as it relates to program initiatives on the business side, forget the system side. There are some real disconnects on the business side but we are seeing with some of the injection of other Federal funds like the Aero funds for example they raised to the top has helped us with our State Education Department and they are very interested in partnering with us because they have responsibilities or viewing the educational progress of children from 8 to 12 and now we're looking even a little bit more in to four years college. So, we find that information from a Juvenile Justice perspective from a child welfare perspective it is very helpful in terms of understanding that child interaction with the educational systems. They want to take a look at the programming and understand the effectiveness of their investments on Foster Care children and children that are in Juvenile Justice. So, it's right now we think that this is a very it's a mutual beneficial relationship and we're proceeding with that.

As I said, our SACWIS system is the repository for our child welfare information, right now we're going through a transformation process, we have older technology as the world changed, we also have an opportunity, we have different data demands on us. And our focus right now is on our caseworker, our commissioner who came with -- to us four years ago, he is a former Director of a contract agency and was subjected to using our SACWIS system. So she came in and immediately hated immediately. Her experience was awful. Our system wasn't much better and as a result she said Bill, it's all about casework and not about housework.

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

So, what we did was we use that as our mantra, we published that and quite frankly one of the strategies and overcoming a barrier is making certain that you have strong sponsorship at the executive level. Our commissioner was prominent in our conversations and negotiations with the legislature, with the governor office, with our divisions of budget, with any external stakeholder that she could engage, she was absolutely terrific because she had the horror stories to tell and quite frankly she had the vision on what is necessary for David system. So, she was just a tremendous advocate and helped us improve the caseworker experience.

Now we had our change in administrations, we have the new governor now and our governor is looking more to run government as a business. And he has spent significant amount of time in government and sometime in the private sector. And it is he developed the New York agenda. And what he is focusing on better ways for us to collaborate as agency and quite frankly opportunities for us to consolidate internally. So, that's another drive and that's another way that we can overcome some of these barriers through data exchanges. I think he wants to take advantage of the financial crisis to breakdown some of these longer term cultural barriers.

You also created the Spending and Government Efficiency Commission, or SAGE commission. So, Governor Cuomo has been right up in front leading us in terms of eliminating waste, fraud, trying to determine where we can create operational efficiencies and at the end of the day reduce the long-term cost of government. There is an understanding that in order to reduce the long-term cost of government, we need to make incremental short-term investments in IT. So, I think that is an opportunity to overcome the barrier for your governor and the governor's office understands that in order to reduce the long-term cost of government, we must make short-term IT investments and they are not insignificant, they are significant investments.

But I think when you hear encouragement from Washington they have people like David that are willing to come to your state and to help you make those arguments from where I sit as a State CIO, this makes it much easier for me. Once I think and I've always use this as a strategy, once I pinpoint to the person telling me that I have to do something it makes it – makes life a little bit easier because it makes life a little bit easier. The shared services conversation that David referred to is being taken very seriously in the state level shared services now we're looking at aggregating purchasing, we're looking at aggregating anything that has to do with the expenditure of state dollars, we're looking at aggregating how we consolidate and aggregate our data centers, how can we have multiuse data centers when there are siloed funding streams.

Well, you know this 887 opens a door a little a bit. This is going to be complicated, yes, are we all going to make mistakes for sure. But we need to take advantage of this now. Former Federal CIO initiated a review of their data centers and initially it was self reporting and the various federal agencies reported over a 1000 data centers a 1000. And he said, you know, there is a more, it's intuitive that he knew that there had to be more so they employed and automated tools that came up with 1200 data centers. So, his

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

objective is to reduce the number of data center to 800 in three years, let's think that's incredible but that's also incredible leadership for us to be able to refer to that at the state level and be able to take those models and drive them home. That's the opportunity that's presented us right now. These various types of technologies have been referred to again by the Federal CIO is providing us with opportunities to collaborate and consolidate and therefore reducing a long-term cost of government. We're looking at things like Master Data Management, at the end of the day when we talk about sharing data amongst programs we need to be 100% certain that we are sharing data about the – to correct people.

So, you've been talking about the unique identifiers and we can talk about various types of strategies and we see *[indiscernible] [00:44:30]* Master Data Management helping us do that. One of the byproducts from this will be the opportunity to provide better entity and predictive analytics. So, we're all focusing right now on business intelligence. And I think in your space in particular in the evaluation space this is a very, very hot topic. And I'm often asked by our program evaluators how can we present them with better data storage, how can we provide them with use of our data warehouse. Am I getting five minutes check.

Tammy White: Not yet.

David: No, no you're one.

Tammy White: You're going to get that.

Bill: Just a little bit more than because I know that in the evaluation space that David points are extremely important. We will say right now with the Affordable Care Act investments that are being made throughout the country in Medicaid data stores and quite frankly also in the public health data storage there are incredible opportunities to leverage those technologies, leverage those architectures that David has referred to and quite frankly build our child welfare applications using those persistent data stores, there are incredible opportunities.

We have invited David and his team to come speak with us in New York to talk to us about what's the best way for us to leverage the architecture and the investments. Mark Szalkus is old as I'm sure many other folks were old, we see this as an opportunity to rebuild our 4E eligibility module. We also see this as an opportunity to learn from the data stores that are being created. I have 15 full-time staff operating my date warehouse. I have about 40 terabytes of data at any one particular time that they are using. So, what we are looking to do is to understand whether or not our health department which runs our Medicaid program. Our health department can provide us with that service so I can get out of the business so that's the way I'm looking at leveraging that type of investment, okay.

We spoke about identity management, we talked about enterprise content management both structured and unstructured so what we're looking to do is to provide all the

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

information about our constituents through single view whether it be stand information whether it be data account information that get entered, whether it be information that perhaps is collected in to the Department of Motor Vehicles which we see as particularly rich data because of the process they have to go through the collected with the six points validation. So, we see our Department of Motor Vehicle and they don't see themselves as same way so we see them as again another very rich source of information that because of our governors direct has allowed us to begin to engage in that conversation. I do want to put a plug in here for NIEM, we intended to use the National Information Exchange Model as our architectural roadmap here as we move forward because we do expect that we will be interacting with entities outside of human services, PMB for example.

Some of the barriers that we are experiencing. So you know we never done business that way or that way of conversation. All conversation with our lawyers is just say no, you know, that they've taken the easy way out for too many years and, you know, when I – before I came to government, I have a bunch of lawyers that worked for me. And it was their job to get the yes there was – it's their job because I want to do stuff and you know at the end of the day I have responsibility to stockholders to drive return their investments.

End of the day the both lawyers couldn't get the yes I fired them, I get rid of them because it was my job as the leader of business process outsourcing companies to figure out how we could drive returns and how we could bring value to our customers. So that's the headset I came into this way. So, they tell me now, I'm single why, show me the wall what's the understanding, what's the liability, what's the cost benefit here? And you know what it's just a different way of thinking for lawyers, they look at the words they are trained to fight us with words and they do.

So, we need to understand and be honed to go back out. And we need to understand the same, show me where are the words, okay, why are the words interpreted that way. Well they are interpreted that way because they don't want to take on liabilities, it's very simple it's their job to keep our government out of arms length. As innovators it's our job to manage the risk, so I think that if you go home and you engage in those conversations some of them will be contagious, well, I think that's part of our job business changing to make certain that we push the envelope and overcome these barriers, I understand why the answer is no. On the administrative pieces, I think we're getting tremendous directions from and cooperation from Washington and quite frankly that I see this right now I see it as how at an agency level.

Are we going to deal with the A87 waivers, we have scheduled pay and a million schedules and I'm saying okay where we have to run, we'll fix them, we'll modify them. We talked about the legal, we talked about the spreads. The operational pieces are very interesting. There are so many examples that's not helping business and there are so many examples of we don't need to do business that way in the market. We need do clearances for respected employees for child care centers and Juvenile Justice facilities. And we recently went through the paper base system where we process it out, 300,000 pieces of paper a year where people that are waiting to get jobs and took us like 69 days it

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

was all shrouded and secrecy because we don't, you can't, we're unable to provide information directly back to the people that are applying that to have to go to their employers -- respective employers and we automated all that.

And as we went through we try to understand where were the opportunities for security breaches. And you know it becomes a lot of it was really driven by labor because labor had to do certain functions in a box because they were people at professional levels that had functional access privileges that people at clerical didn't, and when we take a look in all that which means it's very logical to eliminate the administrative barriers. The financial barriers are you need to attract investment income there is no doubt about that you need to attract investment revenues.

One of those solutions we're going to hear to overcoming these barriers has been in existence for several years my friend Ron he is the guy that when you said phone a friend, well, I'm saying about nine years ago at SACWIS Conference, Ron was the SACWIS Director at Colorado, I was SACWIS Director for New York. And we got to know one another, we were both technical kind of guys and we chatted a little bit and over the years we remain in contact and I knew that Ron as started this whole concept with the Chief Data Officer or they have too far with the Legislation. So, I phoned a friend and that's started that helped me with the solution and it was a network that we created as a result of the conferences like this. So, I think that's another solution to me. I think also we have opportunities here to reach out to some of the educational institutions, they have been tremendous partnership, who made as our State University of New York Center for Technology and Government and tremendous partnership.

So, what I'd like to do now is introduce Ron Ozga from the State of Colorado. And I think Ron as a very interesting story to tell us about implementation of interoperable solutions.

Ronald: Thanks Bill. I'm Ron Ozga, I'm lead CIT Director for Human Services and Healthcare Officer of Financing in the State of Colorado in the Healthcare Policy Financing Agency is our Medicaid Agency in Colorado. My first of the door is I live in the DC area, I want to as you know we are happy to share some of our earthmoving technologies this week, I don't know, if you know about the day before the earthquake back here. We had our largest earthquake in 40 years down in the southern parts and so we are happy to share that with you.

Bill: Go ahead.

Ronald: Well, I'm going to talk about a couple of things as far as what we have implemented within Colorado, run around government for data sharing, interoperability along with some real world implementations of data sharing between various agencies. So, first of was the establishment of government data advisors work. It was enacted through legislation in 2009, however, the path to get there had started back in 2007, 2008. Initially in fact at that time there were some high profile failed IT projects within the state. So, there is – the administration is looking at how do we manage those IT projects

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

at the time each agency had their own IT shop, their own data centers, their own management staff.

So, they started looking at --- look at other states Michigan, Virginia Torres from an IT consolidation places in that. So, back in 2007, 2008 legislation was actually enacted do an IT consolidation what brings the Executive Vice Agency bring that all under the governor's office that information technology. Once that was established, the State CIO came in and established the position of a Chief Data Officer whose primary task was in the Governor's office was to look at all the data across the executive agency all those systems, all those applications as far as what was being gathered, what was being shared, what was not being shared and how that we break down some of those barriers. So, that the initial formation was on the information council with representation on all agency, sit down and looked at an inventory level systems and inventory of the data elements and that where were we doing, duplicate it, gathering the data, find information, add those information there and how that come up with some recommendations how we could do a better job of sharing that information across agencies.

That led them to legislation that actually formed the Government Data Advisory Board as we normally refer to it as GDAB. So the five basic goal of that group is the advise the State CIO as far as what can be done to and establish an interdepartmental protocol for a sharing the data across agencies But you wanted to go beyond just point of state agencies, we wanted to go outside of executive branch, we want to include the other branches of the government. So, there is representation on this board from the judicial side of the house, any of the elected officials Department of Law, State Secretariat of States and so on.

But also to be able to look at how do we share data with those outside of the state government so we have included local representation on the board also like being appointed by the governor down at the county level also School District. Denver Public Schools have the representation on the Board, a local school board is to represent a school board prospect in that and other local agencies. So the purpose of the group is to come up with the recommendations that state CIO for enactment or even rules or policies and procedures that will be done at the state level and then we will allow data sharing to occur throughout level even now during the private foundations, research foundations, they have come up with ways, how do we accomplish that if there had to be a cost factor involved in that what would that structure look so that we could start moving there with that. Also on the board is Higher Ed, Department of Ed, and so on to bring in that piece of the different agencies now.

So duties of the Board is basically is recommendations that states here. They do not have any power to enact anything, but they will make the recommendations on policies, procedures, protocols to the state CIO that would then be able to move those forward into policies, state policy or rules. But basically the real goal, the duty of the Board, is how do we breakdown those barriers of data sharing and so on.

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

Guiding principle, number one on the list, security and privacy they are very important. What we have done, and I will talk about that a little bit further on, is we have established a privacy subcommittee to look at these issues. When the Board first met, we were moving into the end of our second year of being in place; I sit on the Board as a representation for Human Services.

We, initially had a requirement, we have requirement report back to the legislature annually on the progress of the union board, the activities that we are doing. We had issued two annual reports; if you go out to the colorado.gov/oit website those reports are posted out there along with some of the documentations that's already been published by the Group. But anyway the initial plan outlining about 20 initiatives that the Board is going to undertake. We looked at a couple of those initiatives were around privacy, that's part of setting the privacy policy, guidelines, protocols, and looking at liability issues around all the either state, local, tribal laws, I think that enact the sharing of data.

So what we formed was a Privacy Subcommittee that I chaired that I took on those two initiatives to look at those, those issues. Happy to report that at the next GDAB meeting, which comes up in September 16th, we are actually going to be presenting a draft of the private policy that we like to have and enacted for all state executive agencies, along with a number of documents around privacy checklist for the entry level, and also at the data level, along with embedded sharing agreement that outlines 21 items that we feel should be looked at when you establish a data sharing agreement between entities along with the data use template as far as how data should be used, and gives all the things about privacy protection, use of data, who connects this, how it would be shared, whether or not to allowed to be shared by other third-parties themselves. So hopefully, once those are presented next month, they will then go on to the state CI to actually -- CIO to actually move those into policies, get those implemented.

So what the basis though is we understand that information is out there. Everybody is gathering it, that it is useful and it should be shared. But at the same time that we are not going to create a statewide data warehouse *[indiscernible]* *[01:03:44]*. The business area of those applications capturing the data is still going to maintain that data. And what -- and a couple of initiatives that are going on underneath this purview now is, and I am not sure if I brought into this idea or not, but...

We got a project going on for our CUPID. Colorado Unique Person Identifier, CUPID. That venture I'm happy with that. Sure it's the one that will go I don't know. Anyway, the goal is to establish a unique identifier, we are looking at offering and everybody is talking about cloud technology and those type of things. *[Indiscernible]* *[01:04:33]* has a identification as a service so that the state will have the mechanism where they are able to add one signup even down to the local level, you could utilize these management services that had a unique identifier for a client servicing so on throughout the state. And if the concept is and that ID will then link as a cross reference to all the various systems at a gathering point of data. So those systems still maintain their client IDs in that in all the particular information related to that client, but it will cross reference only that you will be able to pick the one ID and know that when you go in Department of Labor, or you go

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

into Human Services or Department of Revenue that that ID once you get find that is the same client process system. So you start pulling the data out here.

Some of the issues we have around that the RFP is out on the street right now. We are hoping to have a rolling back by mid September from the vendors as far as how they implement it for the state net. So many issues that we have gotten into discussions around that is the concept of this golden record, master data record, of what actually should be contained in there. It serves that is if we go beyond just the basic demographics to resolve an identity and start looking at address information and so on, just start this -- once you starting talking within the various business areas, you have issues. If we remove a child from the home due to an abuse situation, you don't want that address in order to be placed in that site published out there, but if you are a victim of domestic violence you may have to program you can't apply for a suitable address that you get issued that becomes your official address. You can go over to the DMV get your license changes out, if you -- we still maintain your real address if that gets published out, it's an issue from that. So there is still some things to be resolved before we give a full implementation, a unique ID, hopefully the proposal there will be some clarification on that.

Anyway, so these are our goals, as far as what we are looking to develop. But basically, here is the breakdown of the barriers around data sharing and how we get that out to the people that may just see it for research purposes or tracking purposes, for DMV case management and so on.

As I said, we identified that. We have a privacy subcommittee. Other things that have been passed in legislation that now come under the purview of the Data Advisory Board as we have a Educational Data Subcommittee. The -- Colorado received a \$17 million grant to implement a Statewide Longitudinal Data System. We participated in the service side for a free school out to the workforce part of it, so all from the education on that committee subcommittee represented from the GDAB, since the year I started myself in the services, Department of Ed, Higher Ed, again the local school districts, local school boards, some of the Head Start program people are there, childhood learning people are there. Again to talk about how do we put the protocols in place to share educational data, not only HIPAA issues, but any given the educational side of house *[indiscernible]* *[01:08:10]*, we are always as far the person to be able to share a student's that are -- education information with other entities outside of the education realm is not being used for educational purposes. So that subcommittee is there.

We also have established a subcommittee for Early Childhood Universal Application. The goal is that if a family comes in to the system, they only have to give their information one time. It should be able to feed any of the other program areas that they maybe eligible for to seek. Again, not only at the state level, such as can or food stamps and so on, but also if they want to get their child in their Head Start program for every childhood learning, School Lunch Program. So again, we have representation from Childcare Centers from Head Start Program and so on as far as discussing how do we put together a overall application in place where the family have to give their basic

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

information one-time and it would be shared with all these other programs that they may be eligible for.

So now, I want to a little bit about the subcommittee on the -- for privacy. Again, as I said, we are going to make our recommendations to the GDAB in September as far as the policy around data sharing relates to the privacy and confidentiality of data, and then what how we manage the compliance in that, with that. As those become available again they will be posted out on the website and we will be more than happy to share the drafts with anybody that would like to see those documents.

The other areas -- the other initiatives out there, if people are looking how do you do resolution of data, the use of data, how long do you store it, if there is a refusal to that what is the escalation policy, there I would say about 20 some initiatives and all policies and procedures that are being developed there and is laid out in the GDAB plan and are also posted out in the website.

So, again, this is just going through the things that we are proposing to submit next month in the privacy committee to that we have data policy, the use of data, access to data, or use of data, entry data privacy checklist, what entries are you looking at as far as a whole checklist to make sure they have the proper mechanisms, procedures, protocols in place to protect the data, and then as they looking that down in the data level.

As part of the, and one of the initiatives, under the Data Advisory Board is we are looking at the whole master data management issue. We are going out doing a full inventory of all the systems applications within the executive branch agencies, identifying down to the eight element: What is the level of security for that data? Is it open to public or is a point that can't be shared at all? It can't be shared at all, well, really what are the barriers to that? Is there a legislation in that? I know as we looked at this, I under Human Services have the Mental Health Facilities within the state. There are statute back from the '70s that talk about they cannot share any health information -- my health information. So as we come across well we are putting groups together, work with the legislators saying can we not modify that and things have changed over the years that it really would be helpful to know in Child Law for how many of those kids may have had involvement with the mental health facilities prior to coming in to the program.

So how can we get that data to make that type of analysis, research without compromising the services, information, the health information that may be stored there but saying that just can't share it, period, is a problem like that. So those are the type of things that the GDAB is looking to try to get changed.

So there are things I want to talk about are the real world implementations on what we've done with data sharing within Colorado. Three specifically I will talk about is Child Welfare to Judicial, Child Support Enforcement to Judicial, and the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System, CJIS.

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

So on Child Welfare to Judicial, we as part of our stack with proposal back in the late '90s in that, we wanted to do an interface to judicial, not just to the human services program but we knew we were going to put in all the court information in a system again to try to ease the case work versus mouse work is somehow instead of the case work there having the input all the data to the SACWIS system as far as court dates scheduled hearing, motions, orders, and so on. We wanted to automate that process. So as we move into the early 2000s judicial came to us and said, you know, we have the SANCA, Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Court Act. Under that there is a grant program where you can apply to do a court improvement projects. As part of that, we would like to do the interface also to that. The advantage we had in Colorado is there was a single court case management system. There is only interface I had to build to get through. And we will get the CJIS a little bit later on but CJIS was really the driving force for us moving into this. Because in CJIS that I'll talk about later, we were already involved on the criminal justice side of it because Juvenile Correction falls under the Human Services. And there was a legislation passed in late '90s about sharing criminal justice between five agencies. So we will talk about that as the last one.

But anyway, so they came and said we got grant money, we want to do this, what do you -- would you guys like being part of it? Yes, but that's what one of our SACWIS function, the harness that we get requested, and you know was optional. So we started planning out with the steering committee as far as how we would implement that interface with three Judicial and Child Welfare, the SACWIS system.

So we were looking at the solar architecture, open services, web services, how do we integrate the data coming within existing systems with minimal changes. We were from the Human Services side fortunate because we had already mapped out all these data within our systems. We already knew we wanted to capture the data, we are going to store the data, Judicial did not. They had just basically things related around -- related to the court case management, the docket numbers, who the parties are, the motion orders mapped, nothing about families, about how you identify a relationship between families, who participated in these cases, who are the collaterals in the cases, placement histories, all those type of things were not in their systems. So the bulk of the work was on their part. For us, it was more of just putting the technology and they have to make the data available, and take the data back.

So what we have done is, we have used the different standards for that. At the time we started doing those there was not the health and human services domain out there, in need, all there was there was pretty much from the justice side of the house. We utilized whatever we could out of those needs, standards, as far as names, address, the common things that existed in systems, but there is really nothing related around placement histories, relationships, and so on. We built all those that and we probably also made sure, at the same time, that we and our people involved at the national level as they started looking at defining Human Services domain that we are involved and what would be done already. Additionally, through sponsorship of the National State Center for Courts, we did get involved in their work groups as far as looking at defining the documents for data exchanges and how do we find them.

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

So anyway we put that in, one in June of 2007 statewide, had some interesting things occur, things occur with implementation. In one case a robber coming in that proposing to get their lives back together, he had a pitz bag. The judge realized in looking at the information in the court system in which came from childhood, he had issued in bench warrant for arrest, which he had outstanding on three or four outstanding warrants I mean in the courtroom. Another one about a father that's been *[indiscernible]* [01:17:17], they could see that he had involved both the child welfare and juvenile because our SACWIS system integrates juvenile correction within the system so he could tell right away what case involvement the client had.

So basically though, it's a reduction of data entry on both sides of the system. Once we have the court case issued and SACWIS case turn up, those two are linked so anytime that any change occurs on each side of the system it's a real time transfer. So if they are in court, a motion gets made and order issued it will automatically, as soon as that is entered into the registers will automatically transfer to the case side of the SACWIS system. That versus if there is a change in child relationship, that information on that we are going resolve it to the judicial system for update in real time.

Again, moving in Child Support Enforcement, move just really quickly in that, in that again *[indiscernible]* [01:18:18] we participated in the development of the Child Support Enforcement package we all had. Basically what I would like to give to you though is need for us, set the groundwork on how data reg is fine, how you could expect it that you knew if you're giving an address in this format and you could take it in that format and remember you got some issues and time resolved data between systems and that.

But really we got that implemented in 2009, again a real time implementation data exchange that since the court order now is just a 50% reduction time in state court order, the child support enforcement means, bottom lines means, we are getting the money to the custodian parent for that child as soon as that court orders for this issue. Therefore, it's benefitting the child and the family court and again the record of that. And again, the accuracy of the data had just increased tremendously. Basically, so now it takes us 90 seconds to send the file and receive it back with a docket and FSR us our Family Service Registry that manages the court orders, child state court orders doing exactly that. But basically, we're able to meet the compliance galvanize around our Child Support Enforcement; and those are some of the stats there.

CJIS was actually a 2009 honorary from me for the implementation there. Like I said, this started back in the '90s. So it was really an in-house bill between Public Safety, Department of Corrections, Judicial, Human Services was via Juvenile Corrections and the Association of County DAs in Colorado. *[Indiscernible]* [1:20:17] as David referred to earlier is that the initial goal was that criminal information need to be shared amongst these agencies so when that trooper was out on the road stopping a person they would know right away if there is outstanding warrants or if there were safety issues involved with that stop.

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

Same way also for how we're moving data between the court system in Juvenile Corrections as far as when a kid was committed into this system and that that we have the actual court order is process net. It was built in older technology back in the late '90s. As we move through and the technology became available to open architecture and web services, the goal was to move that into current technology. So, we undertook a project to move into those technologies utilizing me as I have developed over the years. So we have done it through the process now moving all our data exchanges, again real-time data exchanges to the new current technologies along the current security specifications all those secured to openings and so on and move that forward into the current net. So now, we are accepting queries and transfers from all the five agencies under the new protocols, they i.e., lays the information in packet documents. So, those are all in place and then we are just moving forward, continue to move all of the rest of the system in that.

Again, we tried to do some of this on our own, struggled with it and we brought in national people NIEM came onsite, gave us training on how to build these IEPDs, how to build a package of documentation and once we got through that it was smooth sailing and getting them implemented.

So we implemented in June 2009, we are conform with NIEM on these. We have uploaded about 20 proposed packet documents to the NIEM clearing house for posting and have the net domain and our response time has been reduced by 50 percent of transmitting data between all these five agencies.

So with that, I still maybe got a few minutes of questions.

Tammy White: Absolutely.

Bill Travis: Couple of other things that are going on that you get a chance put up here. We are also doing a Colorado Child Youth Information Sharing Project. We have a pilot at a local level at one of the juvenile assessment center. It's done through the National Justice Information Sharing grant. There's a pilot there on how we can move data between the educational system, the youth correctional system so that when a kid comes in they don't have to go through five or six whole screening down to one that if you want we can now transfer it between different agencies and share that data. At the state level we have adopted the NIEM, we have adopted NJIS standards. And at the state level, we are also doing a pilot and are implementing those for the transfer of that information between the state agencies whether that be the youth corrections and education and the local school boards and that. So those are couple of other things. We didn't get a chance to get them into the presentation but if you want more information, contact information is up there. We'll be more than happy to share a number of different presentations with you about what we're doing. Thanks. Any other questions?

Tammy White : Do you mind please?

Q: I was wondering if you could talk a little bit more specifically about how you've been navigating, sharing mental health information, so you just referred a little bit about it with

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

the JJ, we're definitely working on that in Philadelphia and trying to share information that's happening from our behavior health providers and within our tail over system better in being able to understand both at the system level in terms of psychotropic med users, some of those different pieces as well as the individual level, our chief and foster care home and they have a lot of barriers just in terms of confidentiality that are coming up.

A: Another committee I just kind of pointed to you on the last day. They have formed a Behavioral Health Transformation Council within Colorado which I sit on as a representation for OIT's *[indiscernible]* [1:24:42] commission technology. so one of the big issues there talking about is the information sharing so there is a subcommittee there looking at the protocol and services and that. So that has representation not only for the state and the services are managed those but we do have a community based partners sitting at the table and they are all interested in doing it.

As far as the legislation is concerned, we are working through I think it's a local welfares to give legislation interviews in the next session to help modify that plane which is about capability and share to help information again based upon the guidelines from HIPAA and all other issues. It's really the transformation in health -- behavior health transformation council that is really I think it's going to be the driving force that it was established prior to the current administration probably in January but they are supportive of it. So, it has been maintained and continue to look forward. And like I said, it has even consumer representation on that council to talk about issues around, okay, I've got information in the system on myself that may not be accurate, how do that stuff get out of the system so that when I go somewhere and keep looking up that it's not a cloud hanging over me for the rest of my life. So that person represents more of a youth perspective that's hard for him to help with. It is a council that's been formed. Again, there is information out on the Colorado.gov its getting bigger on there. I'll be happy to give some of the links posted where you can look at that chart of the group and what we're trying to do to change the sharing of all the information.

A: Thank you.

Q: Ron, when I hear your discussion of the levels and comprehensiveness of agency participation and stakeholder participation in your project, do you have any comment about how you manage the process issues of handling such large groups of people?

Ron: It's a challenge especially we -- the GDAB has found a little bit with the change in administration as it has been previous two *[indiscernible]* [01:27:15] officer left prior to administration change and we just got our new Chief Technology Officer on board just two weeks ago. She is going to have responsibility to pick up now the GDAB as far as sentence correction and what the state's going to do around all the architecture. The groups have been good though in cooperation and everybody's shown up in meetings. Our bigger issue with the change of administration is getting the administration to fill some of the vacancies on the board, and get those in place but the groups can compare this. Everybody really does see the need to share the information and they know we have

Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos, Creating Interoperable Information Systems

information. They know we have information, they would like to have and they have information we would like to have from an overall perspective, how we're serving families within Colorado. So I think there is enough passion and support now that people have been identified that is yeah, it's a large group but everybody's took a piece of the 1920 initiative. So I took two of them. Another person took another couple and they put together the work groups of the people that wanted to be involved to know in this part.

Q: I've another brief question then one for David if we have enough time. The other one is in my state I would have to say that our agencies are resourced very close to the bone. How much time would you say is required just an estimate from agencies to participate and look at the policies, look at the technical changes that you've described over time. It sounds like it's some considerable FTE resourcing that would have to be dedicated to really work effectively to make this happen across these state agencies and stakeholders, any comment?

David: Yeah, the comment that I have is, it took us about three decades to get into this mess, so it's going to take us a little while to get back out of it. One thing that I as an observation I've seen is that actually our funding streams actually have created a lot of that that condition. As we have program specific and the resourcing for that is tied with what our fundings coming down to a particular this is the condition we find ourselves in. It's my hope if we can very effectively work with we'll say the example of the cost allocation issue and that there is enough evidence there that OMB will say, you know, this is a pretty good idea, maybe we got to expand this beyond. This one example that we're dealing with here on this waiver that additional funding may become available to actually do that.

Now, what you're referring to also is that on terms of the service delivery you are resource poor in that area too. I don't have a specific answer for that as much as just trying to deal with the system. So, on the business end, there is lot of work that needs to be done for that.

A: I just want to suggest a strategy also. David said that it took us 30 years to evolve to where we are today. So I would suggest that the solution should not be an OpEx solution but should be a CapEx solution. So, I would suggest and I was successful in moving this forward, in government that means you sell bonds, right, so when we take a look at our information assets, they are assets that have a long depreciable lifetime associated with them. So, why should we have to go in every year and justify a need operationally for long-term asset investment. So, what I've done is I've sold bonds in the last three cycles, they call them -- in New York state they call them personal income tax bonds, PIT bonds. I got a great deal too. I mean I sold one for like 1.4 percent. It's a tremendous time to be selling bonds. So, there is a long -- I would suggest that's a strategy -- we're all resource deficient, everyone resource deficiency. You need a strategy that will allow you to move forward in the areas that have been suggested.

Q: It's a great idea, thank you. And my final quick question that you alluded to, David, is there an intimation that OMB either might at least extend because of development

**Session 4.02 – Breaking Down Data Silos,
Creating Interoperable Information Systems**

cycles even now for states to consider going after the money or the opportunity that's available for eligibility up through, as a calendar year '14 I'm not sure how they're setting it or if it's FFY 14 but in any event that's coming up.

David: Sure.

Q: Is there any chance if that could be extended or that other areas may open or any work on your side of the house to bring that idea to OMB?

David: I know the CMS basically has the charge for that specific activity with that and that had been part of the discussion in terms of the absolute priority is to meet that particular deadline, its hard and fast. So as we approach that type of thing there is no commitment on the part of OMB to make some changes. So it is bound to move forward as well, absolutely best we can do. One thing I will say is that CMS will be looking at the implementations, and if there is risk associated with missing that deadline they will adjust appropriately so that we will not have that much overhead for that, make sure you can meet particular mark.

Tammy White: Looks like we're out of time. Thank you very much for coming. Just a reminder, the presentations are posted on our website with their contact information. I'm sure they would be more than happy to answer questions through email or phone call. Please your peers for information and resourcing these three people in particular. So, thank you.