

## Patient Summary Working Group Meeting

### Meeting Summary

Meeting Chair: Allana Cameron			
<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Note Taker</u>	<u>Next Meeting Date</u>
January 20, 2026, 2:00pm – 3:00pm ET	Virtual	Sadrina Petit, Project Analyst, Digital Health Interoperability	TBD
<b>Meeting Agenda:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome/Announcement</li> <li>2. Proposed scope of the next release</li> <li>3. Must Support and Obligation</li> <li>4. Next Steps</li> </ol>			
Presenters			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sonia Balgah, Senior Business Analyst</li> <li>• Lorraine Constable, FHIR SME</li> </ul>			
Invited Guests			
Public			

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

S. Balgah welcomed all participants to the working group meeting and introduced Lorraine Constable. Meeting materials and recording of the session will be made available on the InfoCentral working group.

### 2. Content Presentation

The Infoway team presented each of the agenda items as outlined above. The meeting focused on introducing and discussing a proposed approach for implementing obligations in the PS-CA specification, clarifying how "Must Support" elements should be handled by producer and consumer systems using computable conformance codes.

The presentation deck is available [Patient Summary Working Group Meeting](#)

The video recording is available [Patient Summary Working Group Meeting](#)

### 3. Questions raised during the working group meeting:

#### What is the difference between "Must Support" and obligations?

"Must Support" is a general requirement, while obligations clearly define what systems must actually do, such as populating a field or accepting it without error.

**Why use “shall be able to populate” instead of “shall populate if known”?**

It reflects current conformance testing, where systems must show they can populate the element even if it’s not always available in real data.

**Should consumers be required to display data?**

No. Many systems use registries like PCR to display patient data instead of what’s in the summary, so display requirements could conflict with existing workflows.

**How will out-of-province or patient-mediated summaries be handled?**

A: These cases aren’t fully defined yet and will be addressed in future discussions.

**Should Resource.text be displayed?**

Possibly, since it may contain important clinical information, but no display rules will be added for now.

**Are PS-CA obligations aligned with CA:Core+ and IPS?**

Yes, but PS-CA is slightly stricter to reflect its specific use case.

**What’s the difference between “creator” and “server” in IPS?**

A: A creator may involve human input, while a server usually generates summaries automatically.

**Will PS-CA formally depend on CA:Core+?**

Not yet, but alignment is ongoing.

**Will obligations become more detailed in the future?**

Yes, especially for things like missing sections or narrative text, but the first version will stay simple.

**Action Items:**

Action Item #	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
1	Continue developing PS-CA content and refinements for the next release cycle.	Infoway	TBD	In Progress
2	Next PSWG session will be announced and shared in the InfoCentral forum.	Infoway	TBD	In Progress