



*Virginia Information Technologies Agency*

# IBM Initiate Case Study Research: Findings and Site Comparisons

**Joseph W. Grubbs, Ph.D.**  
Commonwealth Data Governance

---

Presentation to the  
Health Information Technology Standards  
Advisory Committee (HITSAC)  
December 15, 2011



## Research Purpose

- To examine business, technical and governance characteristics of IBM Initiate implementations across sites operating in the health and human service domains
- To compare systems architecture configurations supporting Initiate implementations within the case-study sites
- To identify “lessons learned” from the sites that may inform the Commonwealth’s implementation of the Initiate platform



## Case Study Sites

- State of North Dakota
  - Department of Social Services
- State of Maryland
  - Chesapeake Regional Information System for Our Patients (CRISP)  
Statewide Health Information Exchange (HIE)
- Sutter Health
  - Patient Information Network
- University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC)
  - Enterprise Master Person (Patient) Index



## Data Sources

- Published case-study information from IBM relating to the Initiate implementation
- Web content from the case-study organizations' public-facing Internet sites
- Questionnaires with common measures implemented across the sites
- Conference calls with key project management staff, business leads and technical leads



## Key Questions

- How long has the implementation been running at each site?
- What Hubs (i.e., Person, Patient, Provider, etc.) have been configured in the Initiate platform?
- How many source data systems have been “onboarded” onto the Initiate platform?
- How many matched records are maintained in each of the Hubs?
- Is the implementation based on a registry, centralized or hybrid model?



## Key Questions

- What attributes are the sites using for matching purposes in each Hub?
- Are customized weights used for the algorithms?
- Are the sites maintaining non-matching or “Payload” data for value-added purposes?
- What data-exchange standards govern messaging and data sharing?
- What systems architecture has been configured to support the implementation?
- What database solution did the sites select to manage the enterprise data?



## Key Questions

- Does the system handle updates in batch, real-time or both?
- How much custom code did each site require to facilitate full implementation?
- What was the timeframe from system configuration to production?
- What governance processes have been established for the Hubs?
- How are linkage tasks resolved?
- What data-sharing agreements have been adopted? Are they point-to-point or universal?



## Key Questions

- What Initiate tools (i.e., Inspector, Work Bench, etc.) do the sites use to manage the platform?
- Did the initial data load feature historical data?
- Were the data “cleaned” prior to the initial batch load or after in Initiate?
- What would each site do differently for any future implementation?



# Site Comparison Matrix

See Attached Spreadsheet



## Summary Findings

- Sites ranged from 2003 to 2011 on the implementation dates, and timeframe from configuration to production ranged from 6 months to 24 months
- All sites had at least a Person or Patient Hub and two had a Provider Hub; two were planning a Provider Hub; UPMC had Patient, Provider & Organization
- Three of the four sites used a primarily “out-of-the-box” configuration with some “tweaking” of the matching algorithms



## Summary Findings

- Sites ranged on the level of development in their governance processes and systems; however, Initiate managers worked closely with data stewards from source data systems on data quality and linkage-task resolution
- Three of the four sites used a registry model, and the fourth (North Dakota) anticipates migrating to a hybrid model in the future
- Three of the sites loaded historical data for the initial load; only Maryland had a “go-forward” approach



## Summary Findings

- Managing the enterprise identifier (MPI) remains an ongoing, critical responsibility across sites
- Sites noted the importance of maintaining a close relationship with IBM technical team, particularly for configuring the matching algorithms
- Sites also reinforced the need to establish clear business and technical requirements with IBM during contracting phase
- Core matching attributes for sites were consistent with those selected by the Commonwealth



## Summary Findings

- All of the sites constructed a testing environment during the configuration phase or when onboarding a new source data system
- All of the sites (except for Maryland, which was “go forward”) performed data cleaning and validation prior to loading data into Initiate
- All of the sites configured Initiate to handle batch and real-time (transactional) updates



# Case Study Research

# Questions?