

To: Kathryn.Bramwell@health.gov.au, "M.C.Haikerwal" <mukesh_haik@bigpond.com>
From: Roger Clarke <Roger.Clarke@xamax.com.au>
Subject: **CHF Meeting on Tue 15 Feb**
Cc: "Liz Jones" <Liz.Jones@nehta.gov.au>, "Bettina McMahon" <Bettina.McMahon@nehta.gov.au>, "Melanie Goldwater" <Melanie.Goldwater@nehta.gov.au>, "Andrew Howard" <Andrew.Howard@nehta.gov.au>, jsscn@optushome.com.au (Juanita Fernando)
Date: **Mon, 14 Feb 2011** 08:13:40 +1100

Dear Kathryn, and Mukesh and team

We've been trying to find out for some time what the CHF meeting is about.

We were told, even by people who were going to it, that there was no published agenda.

We don't have time to waste on gab-fests with no agenda, and hence didn't apply.

We now understand the following:

- it's a DOHA-funded event
- it's closed (i.e. CHF members only)
- numbers are limited (i.e. it's not participative or representative)
- it's a "Workshop to engage with consumers on the issues associated with the development of the PCEHR system planning, implementation and other eHealth initiatives. The aim of the workshop is gauge consumer views and enable consumer centred policy input into **the early concept development and design of PCEHR**, and other eHealth initiatives"
Source: <https://www.chf.org.au/pcehr-activities.php>

The understanding that we've had about the Consumer Reference Group is that its scope is almost identical. (The inclusion of "other eHealth initiatives" could be argued to make the scope broader, but in practice that's a pretty nominal difference).

Why is a parallel process running?

Why is this second process restricted, and excludes some participants in the existing process?

How are the outcomes of the two channels to be reconciled?

How meaningful can a discussion of a CRF Charter be if there's a parallel process like this going on?

This enormously undermines the credibility of CRF.

Could you please urgently advise what's going on.

If we should put this up on the new Bulletin Board right now, we're happy to do so, but we felt that you might like the opportunity to do one round off-list, before we open it up to the group as a whole.

Thanks ... Roger and Juanita

To: Kathryn.Bramwell@health.gov.au, Sharon.McCarter@health.gov.au
From: Roger Clarke <Roger.Clarke@xamax.com.au>
Subject: Re: CHF Meeting on Tue 15 Feb -reply to Roger from Kathryn
Date: **Tue, 22 Feb 2011** 09:14:44 +1100

Dear Kathryn, Sharon

At 8:52 +1100 14/2/11, Kathryn.Bramwell@health.gov.au wrote:
>Thanks Roger for your interest in the CHF led meeting - the Assistant Secretary of eHealth Systems Branch, Ms Sharon McCarter, will be introducing the PCEHR system on behalf of the Department. I have asked her to contact you to discuss your and colleagues' views on progression of ongoing consumer engagement in eHealth matters.

I asked specific questions on Monday 14 February.

I've had no substantive response to those questions.

And we've heard nothing about what happened at the CHF event.

In the meantime, Eric Browne has posted to the NEHTA bulletin board a document on 'Consumer Aspirations and Issues', and I've posted a 'Checklist of Privacy Concerns'.

As has been voiced many times at these four events, by many different participants, eHealth initiatives have been plagued for over a decade by a number of serious problems. Key among them have been:

- marginalisation of consumer voices
- avoidance of cumulative processes through continual re-launch of new arrangements that suit whichever new power-broker has just arrived on the scene
- short-cycle involvement by government staff and hence continual loss of corporate memory
- steadfast refusal to provide substantive responses to substantive communications

So the fact that communications along the DOHA channel have started out with the same kind of non-responsiveness is a matter for serious concern.

All consumer advocates want continuity, and don't want the considerable efforts invested between November 2010 and February 2011 being lost in a switch away from the NEHTA process to a separate one that is orchestrated by DOHA, whose structure and processes are unclear, and that so far has excluded at least some of the participants in the NEHTA process.

The NEHTA meeting tomorrow includes agenda items relevant to consultative processes.

Will these sessions deliver clarity on participants' concerns about continuity? A degree of goodwill and mutual understanding has been achieved over the last four months, and your inaction is threatening to blow that away.

I've withheld copies of this email from all but my colleague on the Australian Privacy Foundation Board. But this issue is bound to blow up very shortly, quite possibly in the meeting tomorrow.

Yours sincerely ... Roger Clarke (as Chair, APF)