

# Considerations for NEMSIS Operations and Contract

Based on discussions at the NASEMSO Fall Meeting in Oklahoma City, this document is a summary of considerations that the NASEMSO Data Managers Council (DMC) believes has scalable significance with regard to the operations and future contracts or cooperative agreements NHTSA executes for NEMSIS. This list is not all inclusive of every state data manager's concerns, but rather a representation of the higher level issues on which the DMC generally has consensus and need to be addressed in short order.

- 1) Recommend creation of a process outline identifying directions for how NHTSA can and should engage the DMC and State Directors moving forward.
- 2) NEMSIS Advisory Committee: The prior multidisciplinary committee (even if renamed to avoid the use of the word "advisory") which used to guide NEMSIS needs to be reinstated. The committee should include the DMC Chair, a state EMS Director, a state EMS Medical Director, and other stakeholders as appropriate.
- 3) NEMSIS Request for Proposal (RFP) Considerations: The NEMSIS Technical Assistance Center RFP should include requirements for:
  - Leadership with understanding of EMS operations (e.g., regular ride-alongs, field experience, entering test EMS records into various ePCRs vendor software systems, etc), practicalities, and needs; staffing plan should also include someone knowledgeable in software engineering (business vs technical);
  - Ensuring focus on the needs and interests of the EMS stakeholders from the provider to the state EMS offices on up, in addition to and not subordinate to research;
  - Clear direction on how to implement change requests; and
  - Define a transparent process to include timeline for release and implementation of an RFP for the operation of the NEMSIS program to ensure an open and fair competitive process that would allow any qualified entity the opportunity to bid.
- 4) Request that NHTSA be transparent in its staffing process and timeline for filling the vacant Program Manager position (the NEMSIS COR).

## DMC Vote Results:

- Abstain = 2
- Disagree = 1
- Agree = 32

## DMC Comments:

### Disagree

- Research should be the primary reason you require a national dataset. One of the issues with NEMESIS is they try to balance research and billing but the version 3.5 changes are all about billing and make unnecessary changes (like splitting patient disposition into 3 elements) that endanger the continuity of the dataset going forward (cant map the dataset easily to previous versions). You need research (not billing) to actually assess the pre-hospital system. It also would cause unnecessary hardship on the states (2 major changes in the dataset in less than 5 years) and medics entering the data as they would have to learn (again) how to document properly with the proposed changes. Most states DO NOT CARE about billing as that is a local agency issue (CMS is already the standard for billing). Medics do not care so much about billing when they fill out their reports, billing is done after the fact. Most of the above points I agree but research is the PRIMARY reason you require a national dataset, period.

### Agree

- Updates in NEMESIS should be carefully and thoughtfully tempered with the very real financial, logistical, and operational impacts they have on ePCR vendors, EMS services, state EMS offices, state EMS boards, and other end-users who must create meaningful, timely reports that form the basis for QA/QI, patient care, system performance, and funding justification for future improvements.
- only a comment regarding the first bullet point under 3. It may not be necessary (and to imply it is necessary) that all the NEMESIS leadership have the EMS experience, but some of the leadership at least should.
- Would like to add the following to # 3 RFP considerations:
  - Clear methods on how NEMESIS can support state EMS offices in report development and data dissemination
  - Identify methods to assist state EMS offices with export development for national and in-state EMS stakeholders.
- I agree with some but not all. The goal should be for a collaborative effort and to identify the parties to be involved, however we should not be a part of personnel issues with a NHTSA contractor that has a mission assigned by NHTSA to be fulfilled.