



Task Force on Ranking Priorities  
Draft Meeting Minutes

March 30, 2005, 9:30–11:30 AM  
GMHC (119 West 24th Street), Room 405

**Members Present:** Eli Camhi & Tom Petro (Co-Chairs), S.J. Avery, JoAnn Hilger, Peter Lequeur, Hilda Mateo, Patrick McGovern, Rachel Miller, Lavinia Morrison, Darryl Ng, Joe Pressley, Terry Troia

**Members Not Present:** Rafael Abadia, Felicia Carroll, Steve Hemraj, Marcy Sedlacek

**MHRA:** Bettina Carroll

**OAPC Staff:** Grace Moon, Robert Shiau

**Materials Distributed:**

- Meeting Agenda
- PC Meeting Calendars, April–July
- *Two Approaches for the Task Force's Work Memo*
- *Grid Analysis – Making a Choice Where Many Factors Must Be Balanced*
- *Paired Comparison Analysis – Working Out the Relative Importance of Different Options*
- Sample Paired Comparison Grid for NY EMA Service Categories
- New York EMA Title I Service Type Definitions, HIV Care Services
- New York EMA Title I Service Types
- *Title I Manual, Section IX Appendices, Section B Service Category Definitions (HRSA)*
- *Title I Manual, Section IV Policies (HRSA)*
- *Priority Setting and Resource Allocation – A Ryan White CARE Act Technical Assistance Manual (HRSA)*

**I. Welcome/Introductions**

The meeting was opened and introductions were made. The contents of the meeting packet were reviewed.

**II. Two Approaches of the Task Force**

The co-chairs led the committee in a discussion about the purpose and goals for the Task Force. The Task Force reviewed the memo regarding the two possible approaches to be taken by the Task Force that was sent from Eli Camhi & Tom Petro, Co-Chairs of the Task Force on Ranking Priorities, to Hilda Mateo & Joe Pressley, Co-Chairs of the Priority Setting & Resource Allocation Committee. The Co-Chairs of the Task Force and the PS&RA Committee and the TF members discussed the issues raised at the group's last meeting and the goal of the group's work. Key issues raised:

- The Co-Chairs of the PS&RA wanted the TF to develop a priority setting and resource allocation tool that would be applied following an in-depth review of the service portfolio.
- There was concern that the TF might usurp the role of other committees (Integration Of Care, Needs Assessment, Access To Care, Maintenance In Care). To avoid any conflicts, the Executive Committee would be kept well-appraised of the work of the TF.
- HRSA guidance regarding roles and responsibilities of the PC in priority setting and resource allocation recommended developing general service category definitions. Focusing on individual service types within service categories may be beyond the role of the PC.
- Reprioritization of the EMA's service categories is important, but discussion should also include what services should no longer be funded. In particular, the TF would examine some of the service

categories that during scenario planning had been identified as problematic and potential candidates for elimination from the Title I service portfolio.

- For the review of the service portfolio, members preferred to look at NY EMA service categories rather than the HRSA service categories in order to focus on the service level rather than a “conceptual” level.
- The grantee, DOHMH, was in the process of rebidding all of the service categories over the next two years and it was unclear if there was a need to redefine all of the service elements within particular service categories. The grantee recommended that the TF use HRSA service categories and provide clearer guidance for services when they are rebid.

### **III. Grid Analysis and Paired Comparison Analysis**

The committee reviewed two decision-making tools: grid analysis and paired comparison analysis. The group accepted a recommendation to apply grid analysis to a service category and selected a number of criteria to apply. There was agreement that the grid analysis conducted during the meeting would serve only as an exploratory and educational test of the process and that any results would be completely non-binding.

The TF members identified a number of criteria to be included in the grid:

- Payer of Last Resort/Alternate Providers of Service
- Access To Care
- Maintenance In Care
- Specific Gaps (Geographic, Demographic, Special Population)
- Core Services/Current Priority (HRSA)
- Cost-Effectiveness

(Please see separate *Service Category – Criteria Analysis Grid* for additional details on the grid analysis.)

During the group’s discussion and application of the grid analysis, a number of issues were raised:

- Members wanted more detail about the criteria that would be used and whether the focus would be on getting new people into care or on maintaining services to those who are already in care.
- There were questions about whether the service categories would be redefined as a result of the process.
- There was a request to have staff elaborate and clarify the criteria more fully before the next meeting. The group decided to schedule 2 meetings at the end of April with enough time allotted to allow the group to have an extended discussion along with an opportunity to apply the process. The two meetings would be four hours and staff would query members for availability before a final schedule is determined.

### **IV. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned.