

## InfoRMS

Grouping: v1.1.0BlockVote6

Sorted by: Status ascending

1–11 of 11 as at: 08/Aug/25 11:42 AM

Key	Summary	Description	Resolution	Resolution Description
ER-189	<a href="#">Communication.category: change binding to CommunicationCategory valueSet to be extensible</a>	<p>CommunicationCategory is a valueSet defined in CA:eReC (<a href="http://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/io/CA-eReC/ValueSet/communication-category">http://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/io/CA-eReC/ValueSet/communication-category</a>), and these codes shall be used to populate Communication.category</p> <p>Existing Wording: Communication.category binding to CommunicationCategory valueSet is example</p> <p>Proposed Wording: Communication.category binding to CommunicationCategory valueSet is extensible</p> <p>Submitted By: Mark Fernandes, CHI</p>	Persuasive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The binding strength should be informed by business rules when not dictated by the base standard, when deciding to use preferred, extensible or required. It should be driven by implementation considerations for optimized outcomes. Agreed with strengthening to what is appropriate for eReC implementation across CA.</li> <li>Use <b>extensible</b> binding</li> <li>"Example" bindings are not recommended as our goal is data standardization and interoperability.</li> </ul>
ER-185	<a href="#">personalrelationshipproleype is based on v3-PersonalRelationshipRoleType and will be translated in the future. Patient-contactrelationship contains roles rather than relationships.</a>	<p>CIHI is recommendinng <a href="https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype">https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype</a> as the Pan-Canadian valueset for this element</p> <p>Existing Wording: The valueset for ContactRelationship is noted as <a href="http://hl7.org/fhir/ValueSet/patient-contactrelationship">http://hl7.org/fhir/ValueSet/patient-contactrelationship</a></p> <p>Proposed Wording: <a href="https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype">https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype</a></p> <p>Submitted By: Joanie Harper, CIHI</p>	Persuasive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Align to pan-Canadian valueSet (<a href="https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype">https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype</a>)</li> <li>given the valueset is published for CACDI and will be translated for CA use cases.</li> <li>Maintain <b>extensible</b> binding</li> </ul>
ER-188	<a href="#">Patient.contact.relationship has two value sets listed</a>	<p>The Patient.contact.relationship has two value sets listed (ContactRelationship, PatientContactRelationship). Neither is the recommended pan-Canadian value set.</p> <p>CIHI is recommendinng <a href="https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype">https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype</a></p> <p>Submitted By: Joanie Harper, CIHI</p>	Persuasive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Persuasive to align to CACDI (<a href="https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype">https://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/ValueSet/personalrelationshipproleype</a>)</li> <li>Fix the Terminology page to only reflect the chosen binding</li> <li>Maintain <b>extensible</b> binding strength</li> </ul>
ER-172	<a href="#">MessageHeader.extension: 2 extensions added in ON:eReC to support HTTP Header information</a>	<p>The ON eReC IG has recently updated the MessageHeader resource with the addition of 2 extensions to support HTTP Header information. The extensions are attached to MessageHeader.source and MessageHeader.destination elements. The requirement to support capturing of HTTP Header information originated from vendor testing. Just wondering if PAN CA eReC IG deem necessary to include these extensions as other vendors/implementers may have similar requirements. MessageHeader resource in FHIR R5/6 supports this via</p>	Considered for Future Use	Recommend to defer adding the extension to the pan-Canadian specification until clear usage evidence from OH implementations are documented

Key	Summary	Description	Resolution	Resolution Description
		source.endpoint.endpointReference. however this element is missing in FHIR R4 and also we don't have Endpoint resource profiled in eReC IGs and hence the decision to add extensions for the time being. Submitted By: OH Standards, OH Standards		
ER-113	<a href="#">Business Rules - Specifying a Service - content alignment with rest of implementation guide</a>	is this section's content aligned with the current IG content or might it be a carryover from prior versions? Submitted By: Yaron Derman, OceanMD	Persuasive with Modification	This section is aligned with current IG content.  The following changes are proposed for reader clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The section heading 'Specifying a Service' will use a higher heading level so it appears on the left menu</li> <li>We will link from this section to <a href="https://simplifier.net/guide/Pan-Canadian-eReferral-eConsult-CA-eReC-iGuide/Index/Technical-Context/Messaging/Constructing-Messages.page.md?version=current#use-of-healthcareservice-vs-practitionerrole-in-erec-messages">https://simplifier.net/guide/Pan-Canadian-eReferral-eConsult-CA-eReC-iGuide/Index/Technical-Context/Messaging/Constructing-Messages.page.md?version=current#use-of-healthcareservice-vs-practitionerrole-in-erec-messages</a></li> </ul>
ER-187	<a href="#">The valueset for Organization is an Example value set. If that is the valueset that is intended for use, it should be specified as (Preferred) at a minimum.</a>	The valueset for Organization is an Example value set. If that is the valueset that is intended for use, it should be specified as (Preferred) at a minimum. Submitted By: Joanie Harper, CIHI	Not Persuasive with Modification	The preferred or required valueset should be fit for purpose and not just an example valueset lifted from FHIR. We will remove specifically calling out the binding to Organization.type from the Terminology page along with other example bindings from base FHIR
ER-168	<a href="#">Clarification on CA:Core+ alignment</a>	OH has conducted a gap analysis exercise to identify the deviations between OH eReC IG and CA Core+. There were few gaps identified and raised. Just wondering when would be the PAN CA eReC IG alignment exercise with CA Core+ be done. OH plans to inherit and align with the PA CA eReC IG and hence it becomes crucial for us to know the timelines. Submitted By: OH Standards, Ontario Health	Considered-Question answered	CA:eReC is part of the CA Core+ harmonization effort along with other pan-Canadian specifications and jurisdictional specifications.  The harmonization effort is planned in 2 phases: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For this upcoming release, we are focused on removing alignment breaks between shared profiles in CA Core+ and CA:eReC, so that the profiles are in sync.</li> <li>For the next year's CA:eReC release cycle we plan to re-profile any shared profiles (CA:eReC inherits CA Core+ profiles)</li> </ol>
ER-200	<a href="#">TaskBusinessStatus.extension:StatusReason does not have a valueSet</a>	TaskBusinessStatus.extension:StatusReason does not have a valueSet to refer to for the CodableConcept Submitted By: Mark Fernandes, CHI	Persuasive with Modification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update extension name from <b>statusReason</b> to <b>businessStatusReason</b></li> <li>Add clear usage notes for <b>Task.statusReason</b>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is ambiguity whether <b>Task.statusReason</b> is meant to provide a reason for why a coarse-grained <b>Task.status</b> changed, or if it is meant to provide a reason for the overall status.</li> <li>For clarity, <b>Task.statusReason SHALL NOT</b> be used in eReferral/eConsult messaging,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Key	Summary	Description	Resolution	Resolution Description
ER-159	Publishing valueSet and CodeSystems in Pan-Canadian space	This value set created by OntarioHealth, but the canonical is : <a href="http://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/io/CA-eReC/ValueSet/task-code">http://fhir.infoway-inforoute.ca/io/CA-eReC/ValueSet/task-code</a> . Is this value set and code system published in Pan-Canadian space?There are other value sets which following the same path, CommunicationBarrier,CommunicationCategory, IdentifierType and so on. Existing Wording: TaskCode Submitted By: OH Standards, Ontario Health	Persuasive with Modification	<p><b>Task.businessStatus.extension:statusReason SHALL</b> be used instead to provide a coded reason for why the fine-grained, implementation-specific <b>Task.businessStatus</b> changed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to usage notes under <b>Task.businessStatus</b>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ when the businessStatus code is the same as status code, the same code <b>SHALL</b> be sent in both <b>Task.status</b> and <b>Task.businessStatus</b> to not leave it up for interpretation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Maintain the current Must Support and cardinality constraints for the named elements above in the Task profile.</li> <li>• For the ValueSets - Define distinct terminology value sets for <b>Task.businessStatus</b> (i.e. ReferralBusinessStatus) and <b>Task.businessStatus.extension:businessStatusReason</b> (i.e. ReferralStatusReason) elements as required. CSRC can support this through our standard RFC process for both content and valueset development (<del>ER-159</del>)</li> <li>• The ReferralStatusReason valueset <b>SHALL</b> also be bound to the upcoming ServiceRequest.status.extension:StatusReason CodeableConcept extension (<del>ER-61</del>)</li> <li>• Use <b>extensible</b> binding</li> </ul> <p>ValueSets for Pan-Canadian ownership and maintenance must follow a defined process: <a href="https://infocentral.infoway-inforoute.ca/en/resources/docs/hl7/terminology/4642-process-for-promoting-jurisdictional-valueset-to-pan-canadian">https://infocentral.infoway-inforoute.ca/en/resources/docs/hl7/terminology/4642-process-for-promoting-jurisdictional-valueset-to-pan-canadian</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm valueSets are reviewed and endorsed for pan-Canadian use</li> <li>• Update canonical URLs to reflect ownership between pan-Canadian and Jurisdictions</li> <li>• Assess confirmed valueSets for duplication of purpose</li> </ul> <p>The following valueSets have been endorsed for pan-Canadian use and will undergo the RFC process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MessageEventCode (<a href="https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/message-event-code">https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/message-event-code</a>)</li> </ul>

Key	Summary	Description	Resolution	Resolution Description
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MessageChangeReasonCode (<a href="https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/message-change-reason-duplicate-2">https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/message-change-reason-duplicate-2</a>)</li> <li>• TaskCode (<a href="https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/task-code">https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/task-code</a>)</li> <li>• ReferralBusinessStatus (see resolution on <a href="#">ER-144</a>)</li> <li>• ReferralStatusReason (see resolution on <a href="#">ER-200</a>)</li> <li>• CommunicationBarrier (<a href="https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/communication-barrier">https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/communication-barrier</a>)</li> <li>• CommunicationCategory (<a href="https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/communication-category">https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/communication-category</a>)</li> <li>• PreferenceTypeCode (<a href="https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/preference-type">https://simplifier.net/ca-erec/preference-type</a>)</li> </ul>
ER-144	<a href="#">TaskBusinessStatus - Clarify Ineligible for Service status</a>	INEL = Ineligible for service > I don't view this as a business status of the referral. The referral might be declined due to ineligibility. Submitted By: Yaron Derman, OceanMD	Persuasive with Modification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define a national standard set of codes for a <b>Task.businessStatus</b> valueSet (i.e. ReferralBusinessStatus)</li> <li>• ValueSet will include applicable <b>Task.status</b> codes in valueSet so both values are available to be sent when <b>Task.status</b> code is the same as <b>Task.businessStatus</b> code to not leave it to interpretation</li> <li>• The valueSet will also include common business status that could be argued to be a status reason (e.g. no-show) for integrations that communicate status using 2 elements (i.e. <b>Task.status</b> and <b>Task.businessStatus</b> without sending a separate <b>Task.businessStatus.extension:businessStatusReason</b> - see <a href="#">ER-200</a>)</li> <li>• Use <b>extensible</b> binding</li> </ul>
ER-186	<a href="#">CIHI is recommendinng the CIHI Language Codes value set as the Pan-Canadian valueset for this element</a>	CIHI is recommendinng the CIHI Language Codes value set as the Pan-Canadian valueset for this element Submitted By: Joanie Harper, CIHI	Not Persuasive with Modification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues have been raised with ISO 639-3 - CIHI Language Codes. Currently CA:eReC is incorrectly bound to a jurisdictional subset HumanLanguages, and the base FHIR R4 binding to AllLanguages is proposed instead.</li> <li>• Maintain <b>preferred</b> binding.</li> <li>• Practitioner.communication.language (Not a MS element) should have the same binding</li> </ul>