



HITSP

Healthcare Information Technology Standards Panel

Foundations Committee Report

Panel Meeting

Foundations Committee Organization

- The Harmonization Subcommittee – Bob Dolin, chair**
- Information Interchange Subcommittee – Gregg Seppala, chair**
- Security and Privacy Subcommittee – Steve Wagner / Mike Meyer, chairs**
- Staff Support – Michelle Maas Deane (ANSI) and Ed Larsen**

- Weekly/Bi-weekly calls over three years since authorized by the Board**



The Harmonization Subcommittee

- ❑ **Developed a Panel approved process for harmonizing artifacts across SDOs**
- ❑ **Has produced 4 harmonized artifacts agreed to by all member SDOs**
 - **Administrative Gender Value Set**
 - **Marital Status Value Set**
 - **Body Site Value Set**
 - **Demographics Reference Information Model including person name and DOB values sets**
- ❑ **The expectation is that all member SDOs will develop a convergence plan although the time frame is indefinite and mapping is acceptable in the interim**



The Harmonization Subcommittee (cont.)

- ❑ **Currently working of 4 harmonization projects**
 - **Service delivery location value set**
 - **Medication terminology (route of administration) value set**
 - Issue of competing federal regulations and agencies
 - **Diagnosis type value set**
- ❑ **HSC invites the SCO Summit and/or individual teams of SDOs to pick up these harmonization projects**
- ❑ **Working on lessons learned**



The Information Interchange Subcommittee

- ❑ Began with an expectation of working with SDOs to develop a common messaging format
- ❑ Conducted extensive research into what meta-data SDOs use for messaging to identify common and unique data elements
- ❑ Could not ultimately define a compelling business case to justify all SDOs changing their current messaging methods
- ❑ Did take on two small scale projects with some aspects of information interchange
 - Interchanges with Provider Registries
 - Query (by pharmacy) for discrete EHR data
- ❑ Want to find new sponsoring SDO for these projects



The Security and Privacy Subcommittee

- ❑ Completed both a Security and Privacy Matrix which were Panel approved
- ❑ Suspended its operations at beginning of ARRA Tiger Team efforts last April – work being done in the SPI Technical Committee



FOUNDATIONS LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS



Foundations

❑ Lessons Learned

- Process works but not clear whether SDOs will actually take steps to harmonize to agreed value sets
- A compelling business case or mandate is necessary to get provide motivation for SDOs to actually prospectively harmonize their standards

❑ Obstacles

- Prioritization
- Lack of shared cross-SDO sense of priorities limits our ability to proactively form harmonization working groups.

Harmonization is directed at using standards (current or newly developed) to meet business and policy requirements through implementation guidance.

- Lack of overarching standards harmonization and implementation process in the United States dilutes potential volunteer bandwidth. A clear process will provide a focused point for participation by critical mass of stakeholders



Recommendations to Accelerate

❑ Prioritization

- Work with SCO Summit/stakeholders to develop a shared set of priorities for both harmonization of current standards and prospective harmonization
- A harmonization process needs to be continued to insure interoperability
- Foundations developed a sound technical harmonization process but this does not address policy and business harmonization
- Implementation guides are necessary to actually use base standards
- Seek periodic reports from SDOs regarding their progress and hurdles towards adoption of each harmonized artifact.



Harmonization Obstacles

- ❑ No Vocabulary infrastructure
 - *Many overlapping efforts (within HITSP - Foundations, IRT; outside of HITSP - HL7 CTS, IHTSDO, NLM, USHIK, caDSR, value set summit, FHA)*
 - *Lack of defined requirements for vocabulary infrastructure*
- ❑ SDO participation
 - *Unlike HITSP Technical Committee, which harmonize existing standards, Foundations Harmonization requires prospective agreement among the SDOs to harmonize their standards*
 - *Foundations has enjoyed the regular participation of X12, NCPDP, and HL7. Other SDO involvement has been spotty.*



Information Infrastructure Obstacles

- ❑ Developed three messaging layers”
 - Transport
 - Meta-data
 - Payload
- ❑ Found that SDOs may mix elements of each layer
- ❑ Most of the business value is in the payload
- ❑ Common data transport will eventually use common meta-data but the business case is not yet present



Recommendations to Accelerate

- ❑ Develop a Vocabulary Infrastructure
 - Engage ONC and federal and private sector stakeholders to define a process for collaboration in a common vocabulary infrastructure Collaborate with other stakeholders to complete a set of vocabulary tooling requirements - build on HITSP work
 - Promote, encourage and otherwise facilitate SDOs to update their USHIK information on a regular basis and for additional SDOs to add their information to USHIK

- ❑ Insure internal consistency and coordination of harmonization / vocabulary infrastructure
 - Across clinical, administrative and financial domains (more than vocab but includes content exchange and transport)
 - Define roles and responsibilities for decision making, updates, etc.
 - Insure usability by all stakeholders



Vocabulary Infrastructure

- ❑ Need to identify stakeholders and define a process for collaboration so that industry can pooling resources towards a common goal.
- ❑ Collaborate with, but develop a HITSP-specific set of vocabulary tooling requirements.
- ❑ Identify where in HITSP technical (vocab, modeling) decisions are made, and how those decisions are cascaded to other committees.



Separation of Concerns

- ❑ Harmonized implementation guide developers serve need of policy makers and implementers
- ❑ Different expertise needed to develop harmonized implementation guides
 - Terminology experts
 - Messaging and Content Standards
 - Subject matter experts
- ❑ Provide clear roadmap from requirements to implementation
 - Business requirements
 - Vendor development
 - User adoption

