**Conflict Free Access and Planning Workgroup Meeting Notes**

**Meeting Details**

| | |
|---|---|
| Meeting Name: | Conflict-Free Access and Planning |
| Meeting Date & location: | August 17, 2022 @ 8:30a.m. – 10:00a.m. – Teams Meeting |
| Call in number | Teams Meeting |
| Leader/Facilitator: | Belinda Hawks / Remi Romanowski-Pfeiffer |
| Next Meeting: | September 28, 2022 @ 8:30a.m. – 10:00a.m. |

# Key Discussion Points

### Review Sequence of Frame

- The workgroup was reminded of the "Inform, Frame, Feedback" approach used to facilitate the decision-support it will provide to the state. The workgroup is in the "Frame" portion.
- All past materials and references to requirements can be found on the State's website.
- BPHASA will consider portions of the "Frame" and "Feedback" phases concurrently with the workgroup.
- The activities in "Frame" include:
  - Define Problem: The group completed in the May meeting
  - Define Criteria: This is the focus of the June and July meeting
  - Develop Options
  - Evaluate Options
- Options are the approaches to address Conflict-Free Access and Planning that will be considered by the State. Options still need to be developed. The State has not chosen an option.
- Criteria are areas that may be impacted by Conflict-Free Access and Planning. Criteria can be considered the "rubric" that each option is graded. Criteria may have several sub-criteria.
- Each Option will be evaluated using the Criteria to develop feedback for the State. Each option will have pros and cons.
- Workgroup Member Question: How can the implementation timeline possibly be successfully achieved before the federal enforcement deadline?
  - The tentative plan for implementation is to start with the state deciding on an option and setting parameters for implementation. Then the PIHPs would likely be expected to provide their plan for implementation within the provided guidelines.

### Review Criteria and Sub-Criteria

- The group reviewed the process to draft Criteria and Sub-Criteria. First, the group drafted Criteria/Sub-Criteria. Then the Criteria/Sub-Criteria were edited to ensure consistent structure, relocate implementation suggestions, and to remove duplication. Criteria and Sub-Criteria will be reviewed in this meeting. Members were invited to reach out to Josh and Remi with suggested revisions, if their breakout group's content was not reflected. The group was

reminded that they will be able to prioritize Criteria and Sub-Criteria in a future questionnaire/survey.
- The detailed Criteria/Sub-Criteria the group reviewed can be found on the State's CFA&P Website. Below are summary items and questions brought up in the CFA&P meeting.

**Breakout Group #1**

- Summary: This group had, by far, the most Sub-Criteria to review and the most incoming discussion items from other breakout groups. General edits to this group's content included abridging and removing redundancies.
- The general statements from this group included:
    o Each option should consider how it impacts autonomy of choice.
    o Each option should consider how it impacts access to services and supports.
    o Each option should consider impact on continuity of services/supports.
- Breakout Group #1 Questions/Concerns:
    o Plan language should be reconsidered because "plan", "person-centered plan", and "plan of service" are not synonymous.
        ▪ Remi and Josh will follow-up with Group 1 with how to phrase plan language.
    o How is compliance measured for each of these?
        ▪ The group's role is to identify what high-level areas should be considered for each option. It is still too early to define compliance or quality measures.
    o Why doesn't location reference virtual options like Breakout Group #1 indicated?
        ▪ Virtual options may be a "How" or implementation consideration and is too specific for Criteria/Sub-Criteria. The Sub-Criteria titled, "*People meet with providers in a location that is easy to access*" should be broad enough to capture any access considerations, such as home/community or telehealth/virtual options.
        ▪ Remi and Josh will follow-up with Group 1 with how to phrase "location" language to be sure it is broad enough.
    o What does the Sub-Criteria titled, "*People with high needs are provided services/supports regardless of insurance coverage*" mean?
        ▪ This item was in reference to "safety net services" identified as an important component for each option to consider. "Safety net services" has a specific meaning that needed to be rephrased for clarity.
        ▪ "Regardless of insurance coverage" does not accurately capture what is intended by "safety net."
        ▪ Remi and Josh will follow-up with Group 1 with how to phrase "safety net" language.
    o A workgroup member indicated they have concerns about information exchange as it is an important component of a system weakness.

**Breakout Group #2**

- Summary: The Criteria titled, "*Range from Status Quo*" has several details that were moved into the implementation documentation.

- The general statements from this group included:
    - Each option should consider how much change it requires to the system.
    - Each option should consider how it impacts the system's viability.
- Breakout Group #2 Questions/Concerns:
    - *Range from Status Quo/Minimal System Changes* does not include the details that the group outlined.
        - Many of the items included in that Criteria were more in-depth than what is needed in the Criteria and Sub-Criteria. They were either "How" or implementation items.
        - Remi and Josh will provide the CFA&P Workgroup with a summary of all "How" and implementation items.
        - Remi and Josh will follow up with Breakout Group #2 to discuss Minimal System Changes.
    - *Range from Status Quo/Minimal System Changes* is not important. The system may need significant change.
        - This item indicates that each option should consider how much change it may require. If two options are equal in every other Criteria (e.g., Access to Services/Supports, Continuity of Services/Supports), but one requires significantly more changes, the one with less changes may be more desirable. This Criteria is not requiring a certain level of change or stating that only minimal changes should be made. It is saying that each option should consider how much change will be required for its implementation.

**Breakout Group #3**

- Summary: This group had many suggestions on how to get to administrative efficiency and how to cut waste. Suggestions for implementation were documented separately. The Criteria named, "*System Structures and Relationships*" seems to be more of a list of system components each option will need to outline and will be used to support option development.
- The general statement from this group is, "Each option should consider the impact it has on costs of administrative activities."
- Breakout Group #3 Questions/Concerns:
    - Where did the parking lot items go?
        - All parking lot items will be sorted and provided to the state. All "How" and implementation suggestions will be documented and provided to this group.
    - Can *System Structures and Relationships* include an item about information exchange systems?
        - TBDS will review this with the state and consider how to include this in the option development process.

**Breakout Group #4**

- Summary: This group focused on identifying existing federal, state, and tribal programs that need to be harmonized.
- The general statement from this group is, "Each option should consider how it aligns with other activities like federal grants, state and tribal initiatives."

**Follow Up and General Questions**

- TBDS will collaborate with the state to reach out to individual breakout groups via email about required questions and clarifications for each group.
- The group will be provided a summary of all "How" and implementation considerations they outlined in the feedback form and during breakout groups.
- Once Criteria and Sub-Criteria are finalized, the group can expect to participate in a questionnaire to indicate how they prioritize each item. The State is working with advocates to ensure feedback is gathered from people served and families.