

Strategic Planning and Alliances Steering Committee
August 2, 2022
Meeting Notes

Attendance			
Members Present:	Ann Marie Hill Randi Rycroft (chair) Betsy Kohler	Winnie Roshala Mary Jane King Iris Zachary	Monique Hernandez Wendy Aldinger
	Dennis Deapen Jenna Mazreku		NAACCR Staff Present: Karen Knight
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION		ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Roll			
2. Review notes – Randi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes approved. 		
3. Update on SPA in-person meeting – Randi Meeting will be held 9/26-9/28 in Princeton, NJ. Travel 9/25. On the 28 th , half day meeting with the Board.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members to review information on travel arrangements per Charlie’s e-mail. More information will be forthcoming.
4. Update on metrics provided to the SMP Workgroup – Randi SPA SC Metrics provided to the SMP WG: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Gaps from current to future state of cancer surveillance identified and documented Partners engaged and strategies identified to address gaps Findings with proposed strategies communicated to members and partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Randi said SMP may provide feedback or suggestions; if so, she will report back. 		
5. Strategic Alliances, plans for pre-work and in-person work – Randi From the last meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members were asked to review list of organizations and answer questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is the benefit of the group to be in partnership with NAACCR? What groups are not on the list but should be? Identify gaps that will need additional partnerships. Note how difficult it might be to establish new partnerships. Reviewed list of organizations and Power & Interest Grid.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ann Marie has an MHA intern who could help work on preliminary research for this activity. Betsy said need to determine what we want from these organizations. Dennis suggested the goal be to determine which organizations are most likely to benefit registries and which relationships are symbiotic. Randi said would like to think of potential partners not on the list and to determine which relationships are worth our time. Reviewed Power & Interest grid. Ann Marie said this was meant to assess competitors initially. “Interest” in this document indicates NAACCR’s level of interest. Assessment was done at the Board level. We could do a similar grid with other factors (e.g., visibility/relevance). Relevance to those groups may be worth considering. Randi noted that this analysis was done awhile ago by a different group. It may be different now. For instance, VA may not be Low Interest now that legislation is being considered. Another example is that CSTE is advising Biden administration on epi 		Members will send to Ann Marie and the group any other organizations not listed. Then the group will need to prioritize/categorize. Ann Marie will speak to the intern about researching these organizations for information; she will also ask him to research foundations for potential funding opportunities.

	<p>issues but may not have been as influential pre-COVID-19. ACS and NACDD should also be revisited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mary Jane said perhaps some of the organizations in the Low Power/Low Interest group could be leveraged to help central registries. • Just because an organization is not in the “manage closely” quadrant doesn’t mean the relationship with the organization isn’t important. • As the Board considers its priority projects, it would be helpful to identify which of these organizations could use support. • As we evaluate the organizations, identify where there are gaps that a partner organization could help. • Identify benefit to the membership. • Need to further define what to put in the table. Could be multiple grids. • Perhaps consider how to communicate better to some of these organizations. • <u>Discussed which organizations are not on the list:</u> HL7, Digital Bridge, ONC HIT, Canada Health InfoWay (HL7 transmit standards), Canadian Cancer Society, Childhood cancer groups (St. Jude’s, Childhood Oncology Group, Childhood Cancer Data Initiative, Sick Kids, Cancer in Young People in Canada, Stupid Cancer), Moonshot, Patient advocacy groups (other than Komen), CBTRUS, Brain Cancer Registry of Canada, American College of Radiology, other registries (Firefighter registries, Immunology registries, NIH genetic testing registry, Gilda Radner Ovarian Familial Registry), group working on national patient health identifier, Society for Epi Research, APHA, Flatiron (needs closer scrutiny; they said they would put cancer registries out of business), Friends of Cancer Research (NCI’s advocacy group), One Voice Against Cancer, Comprehensive Cancer Control, National Partnership, National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship, vendors/technology experts (TBD) • Flatiron may be of particular interest, even though we don’t know much about their recent activities. Monique may reach out to her contact at Flatiron to learn more about their activities. Dennis sent the group a recent article about Flatiron initiatives. • <u>Possible categories:</u> Funding, content expertise (including tech expertise), help develop relevance, help with advocacy, strengthen current partners, providing input on standards, political influence, benefits to member registries, gaps they could help us fill. • Then will use <u>different tools</u> to assess and compare for competition, risk analysis, relationship building, marketing, etc. • Who else on the list would <u>fund</u> NAACCR? Battelle, NACDD, Komen already have. Mary Jane pointed out that funding of individual registries is also important to consider. • <u>Which of our sponsor’s projects do we want to follow more closely and support (i.e., CDC cloud project or NCI’s NLP project); can we have more influence on these projects?</u> • What about including vendors? Dennis said we are far removed from technological world that could have solutions to many of our challenges. How do we leverage technical expertise? Added to the list as a category. Will need to identify specific 	
--	--	--

	<p>organizations. Others agreed that we are behind in technology and should address this in our analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will continue discussing what criteria we will ultimately use to assess and prioritize relationships. 	
6. Continue discussion of ideal cancer surveillance data model – Randi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was not discussed due to time constraints. 	
Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday, September 6th at 11:30 am ET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 9/6 meeting will be focused on planning the in-person meeting.