

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>
March 18, 2025, 1:00pm – 2:00pm ET	Virtual	Sadrina Petit, Project Analyst, Digital Health Interoperability	March 21, 2025, 1:00pm- 2:00pm ET
Meeting Agenda: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome/Announcements 2. Backlog Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MustSupport Definition • Obligation Framework • MustSupport Backlog Items 3. Next Steps 			
Presenters			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allana Cameron, Senior Product Manager, PS-CA • Sonia Balgah, Senior Business Analyst, PS-CA • Lorraine Constable, Standards Architect Dogwood Health Consulting 			
Invited Guests			
Public			

1. Welcome and Introductions

S. Balgah welcomed all participants to the working group meeting and introduced Allana Cameron, and 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. During the meeting, we reviewed backlog items related to the Must Support definition, the Obligation Framework, and additional Must Support backlog items.

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 "shall populate" and "shall be able to populate"?

"Shall populate" means the system must provide data if it's known and allowed. "Shall be able to populate" means the system must demonstrate capability (such as during conformance testing), but the data might not always be present or required.

Could patient education materials be automatically populated into patient records using this framework?

Not currently. The patient summary focuses on clinical data and does not include automatic population of patient education materials. However, this is recognized as a valuable use case for separate consideration.

Given that the obligations framework is new, should we adopt it immediately or wait?

The recommended approach is to wait and monitor international adoption, especially through IPS. The PS-CA will retain the current Must Support definition for the 2.1 release and consider adopting obligations once IPS finalizes them.

Even though obligations are new, isn't there value in adopting them to clarify Must Support requirements?

Yes. The obligations framework provides clear business requirements and adds nuanced clarity to Must Support definitions, even if full technical implementation is deferred.

Why is IPS adopting obligations when they're still at a low maturity level?

IPS is adopting obligations because the existing "Must Support" definition lacks precision and clarity. Obligations allow specifying nuanced business requirements clearly, distinguishing elements that must always be provided ("shall populate") from those that systems must merely be able to provide ("shall be able to populate").

Can obligations apply beyond Must Support elements?

Yes, obligations can apply to any element, not just Must Support elements. However, IPS initially plans to use obligations only to clarify elements already flagged as Must Support, providing clearer definitions and requirements.

Given that obligations are new (FHIR maturity level 1), isn't adopting them risky?

There's minimal technical risk because obligations are extensions that systems can safely ignore. However, the concern is valid regarding the stability of obligations, and the recommendation is to monitor IPS adoption closely before widely applying them in Canada.

Do obligations extend beyond FHIR's role as a data-exchange standard into information architecture?

Yes, obligations represent broader concepts that go beyond data exchange, reaching into information and application architecture. While primarily used within FHIR for data exchange clarification, obligations could influence how data is structured and handled within systems.

If we remove "Must Support" from an element (like "authoredOn"), does it mean we can't populate it?

No, removing Must Support doesn't prevent populating the data. It simply means that populating this element isn't mandatory to demonstrate system conformance. Systems can still include the element whenever it's appropriate.

Is "authoredOn" (date written) important for medication requests, and should we keep it Must Support?

While important in prescribing contexts, for patient summaries, the critical date may be the prescription's validity period rather than the authored date. The group will further discuss whether "authoredOn" should remain a Must Support element considering IPS alignment.

Action Items:

Action Item #	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
1	Attend the next working group meeting for March 21: 1- 2 pm ET	Working group members	March 21: 1- 2 pm ET	In Progress
2	Review and address feedback on "must support" backlog items for the upcoming PSCA 2.1 release	Infoway	March 21, 2025	In Progress
3	Assess and align with the IPS obligations framework for future PSCA releases after IPS publishes their 2.0 version.	Infoway	March 21, 2025	In Progress