

**California Health & Human Services Agency
Center for Data Insights and Innovation
Data Exchange Framework Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting
Chat Log (12:00 PM – 1:00 PM PT, July 10, 2025)**

The following comments were made in the Zoom chat log by Members of the TAC and staff during the July 10, 2025, meeting:

2:07:02 From Jeff Jarrett to Everyone:

Perhaps "accessible" rather than "simple" would be better.

12:07:15 From Rim Cothren, CalHHS CDII to Hosts and panelists:

Thanks, Jeff.

12:07:25 From Rim Cothren, CalHHS CDII to Everyone:

Thanks, Jeff.

12:14:47 From Emma - Manatt Events to Hosts and panelists:

Poll #1: <https://forms.office.com/r/PucQyv436E>

12:16:04 From Kayte Fisher to Hosts and panelists:

I chose #3, with the caveat that perhaps there are a few 'primary' forms for various data types and situations, but also some secondary variations that are more specific

12:18:27 From Hans Buitendijk to Everyone:

+1 on David

12:20:02 From Eric Jahn to Everyone:

Agreed with David. Over time (and even initially as a template/guidance), we can model and match various consents using ontologies, and eventually go back and standardize consent grant types.

12:20:03 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

Innovation evolves to needed norms. I encourage us to create a mechanism - ongoing working group- to evolve a standard DATA Model for Consent. But this workgroup has highlighted we need 5-7 different consent types already.

12:21:55 From Shannon Rohall to Hosts and panelists:

@Kayte, forms perhaps use case based

12:22:20 From Diane Dooley to Everyone:

I like the idea of templates. An adolescent consent form relevant to teen sensitive services would be very useful.

12:24:32 From Hans Buitendijk to Everyone:

+1 Jim (and still +1 with David as well) as it will likely be a mix as described.

12:24:45 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

Templates are in essence “Data models”. Consent has to be exchanged electronically.. not signed paper..

12:24:54 From Kayte Fisher to Hosts and panelists:

I'm also thinking about translations into other languages. The more standardized it can be, the better then chances that translations will be consistent and accurate

12:25:11 From Emma - Manatt Events to Hosts and panelists:

Poll #2: <https://forms.office.com/r/SycdvuSBX2>

12:26:35 From Irene Lintag Alvarez to Everyone:

I agree with what kayte said, looking at the bigger picture and reducing administrative and legal burden to have multiple consent templates with the same language would ease health centers, cbo's, etc. from recreating the wheel.

12:28:29 From Diane Dooley to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with what Alana said about having training and/or a process for obtaining consent

12:29:22 From Julie Silas to Hosts and panelists:

Hi All - so sorry I have to sign off early today!

12:29:52 From Eric Jahn to Everyone:

In addition to discussing eventually standardizing consent types, we can more readily standardize the method/metadata for requesting consent, retrieving consent, providing consent, revoking consent, etc.. This doesn't necessarily involve transport like HTTP versus DSM/SMTP, but should involve necessary message metadata, payload components, workflows, etc..

12:29:53 From Robby Franceschini, Blue Shield of California to Hosts and panelists:

Is the intent of option #1 only to refer to consent to share information related to care delivery? Payers do not generally provide services but collect consent to share

12:30:19 From Alana Kalinowski, she/they, CIE/211 SD to Everyone:

+1 David

12:32:24 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

+ 1 to Eric

12:33:25 From Emma - Manatt Events to Hosts and panelists:

Poll #3: <https://forms.office.com/r/00KLdisy3M>

12:33:32 From Kayte Fisher to Hosts and panelists:

I don't think I have the tech knowledge to give a helpful answer to this - I leave this to the experts.

12:34:35 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

I want to emphasis “exchange Consent permission”

12:36:58 From Shannon Rohall to Everyone:

Thank you for the conversation. I need to jump early.

12:38:39 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

If we accept the notion of at least 5 consent TYPES, the rules/ guidelines on Consent Sharing is tied to the Consent TYPE.

12:38:41 From Alana Kalinowski, she/they, CIE/211 SD to Everyone:

+1 to Eric's added complexity

12:42:03 From Eric Jahn to Everyone:

We can sync the record locators to a smaller set, so consents can be retrieved in an ad hoc fashion (even just if for audit purposes), but that would depend on the requestor having permission to retrieve the consent from the consent store.

12:42:11 From Diane Dooley to Everyone:

There might need to be general consent for most needs with a secondary type of consent which is more extensive for more critical and complex cases.

12:43:18 From Hans Buitendijk to Everyone:

N consent types need not mean n repositories

12:44:32 From Emma - Manatt Events to Hosts and panelists:

Poll #4: <https://forms.office.com/r/W5Qux8cRz1>

12:45:58 From Derek Plansky to Hosts and panelists:

there should be a 5th option where they update it in one place

12:46:11 From Derek Plansky to Hosts and panelists:

but the data is federated

12:47:35 From Rim Cothren, CalHHS CDII to Everyone:

@Catalina: Can you drop the four choices in chat to facilitate this discussion?

12:48:51 From Eric Jahn to Everyone:

+1 David ... And third-party apps can store all of a person's consents they have made in many places. From this third-party app, they can manage the consents residing in the many locations.

12:48:52 From Catalina Cole | Manatt Health to Everyone:

1) All consents are stored in a single repository that an individual can access to manage them

2) The individual has access to a shared directory or registry to locate where consent is stored, but manages it in multiple locations

3) Each consent storage location queries other consent storage locations directly to find and retrieve consent as needed so that the individual manages consent in one location but it remains stored in many

4) Individuals manage their consent with potentially multiple individual entities where they established consent

12:52:23 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

DXF supports the notion of Intermediaries.. sharing data.. I believe County level data intermediaries will solve this Consent sharing..

12:54:20 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

We should work on 5 Consent Types in a Consent Data Exchange model.. and encourage the 740 DXF Grantees to develop a JSON doc model... to. "exchange" Consent attached to a "Closed Loop referral".

12:55:22 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

+ 1 to Lucy and Rim

12:55:55 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

We've created a set of "artifacts" - these 4 sessions" to become a "design resource" for innovative software engineers to insert into current systems.

12:56:29 From Eric Jahn to Everyone:

Consent resolution always has to be computable based on relevant governance.

12:56:49 From Derek Plansky to Hosts and panelists:

consent resolution should just be date based... most recent wins

12:56:52 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

In current consent records, there is a notion of "Date Given" and "Duration of Consent" and so it creates the notion of "Consent expired".

12:58:04 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

It reinforces my belief in 5 Consent types, a Consent Exchange Data model, and experimentation county by county.

12:58:46 From Derek Plansky to Hosts and panelists:

what are the 5 types?

12:58:53 From David McCann to Hosts and panelists:

Thank you to all the panelists. Contact me if interested in more dialog