

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 30, 2024, 1:00pm – 2:00pm ET	Virtual	Sadrina Petit, Project Analyst, Digital Health Interoperability	February 13, 2024, 1:00pm – 2:00pm ET
Meeting Agenda: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome & Announcements 2. Status of Ballot Process 3. Attester: Implementation Considerations 4. Patient Summary Use Cases, Work in Progress & Look into the Future 5. Next Steps 			
Presenters			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allana Cameron, Product Manager, Patient Summary • Dr. Rashaad Bhyat, Senior Clinical Leader, Digital Health Interoperability • Sheridan Cook, Standards Lead 			
Invited Guests			
Public			

1. Welcome and Introductions

A. Cameron welcomed all participants to the working group meeting and introduced Dr. Rashaad Bhyat, and Sheridan Cook. 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 focus of the meeting was on discussing the status of the ballot process, considerations for attester implementation, and the patient summary use cases that are works in progress.

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 are the potential challenges with the attester element's flexibility?

Different jurisdictions implementing the attester element in varied ways (e.g., using organization vs. practitioner, or not including it at all) can lead to complexity, especially for systems expected to process any type of attester information.

How does the Attester element relate to liability concerns?

There are concerns that the term "Attestation" might imply liability for the accuracy of the information in the summary. Clarification is needed that attestation refers to sending the information as it exists in the clinic's records without guaranteeing its accuracy.

Why is consistency across jurisdictions important for the Attester element?

Consistency helps reduce the burden on health IT vendors and healthcare systems by minimizing the variations they need to accommodate in their systems, making it easier to maintain interoperability and data exchange.

What is the significance of detailed attester information?

Detailed information about the Attester, including their credentials and associated organization, is crucial for the usefulness and traceability of the data in patient summaries.

What is the Attester "mode" sub-element, and what are its implications?

The "mode" sub-element within the attester element indicates the level of authority of the attestation (e.g., personal, professional, legal, official). Implementing this accurately requires a thorough understanding of clinical and legal contexts, affecting how patient summary content is created, received, and stored.

What are the implications of removing "Must Support" from the attester element?

Removing "must support" would mean there is no expectation for systems to demonstrate the ability to handle the attester element, potentially allowing them to reject summaries that include it, which could impact data completeness and interoperability.

What are the options for addressing differences in the "Attester" element implementation?

The group discussed several options, including applying "Must Support" to specific reference targets, removing "must support" entirely, or allowing jurisdictions to set their own requirements.

Can an "absent reason" be used with the "Must Support" designation for the "Attester" element?

Yes, one proposal was to keep "Must Support" but allow for an "absent reason" or other explanations to provide flexibility while maintaining support. However, consideration is needed as this may introduce stricter requirements for vendors to meet for an element that is otherwise considered optional (i.e., does not need to be populated).

What are the implications of removing "Must Support" from the "Attester" element?

Removing "Must Support" would eliminate national expectations for this element, allowing jurisdictions to decide whether to require it based on their specific needs. Attester is still considered "Must Support" in the International Patient Summary (IPS) Specification. If "Must Support" is removed in PS-CA 1.1, PS-CA conformant vendors seeking to be conformant with IPS may need to apply additional configuration to their systems to meet the IPS expectations for this element.

How can the "Attester" element be made jurisdictionally compatible?

The working group considered making the "Attester" element compatible by allowing a specified "not permitted" reason when the element is not provided, tailored to each jurisdiction's legislation. The working group also identified relaxing the "Must Support", and allowing jurisdictions that will require support for the "Attester" element to further explore implementation patterns for harmonization.

Is it important to keep the "Must Support" designation for international compatibility?

Yes, maintaining "must support" could align with international standards, but the need for national harmonization and practical implementation may lead to its removal.

How do automated data exchange workflows affect the "Attester" element implementation?

Automated workflows that leverage data as-is may face challenges if an "Attester" is required. The group discussed the need to support these workflows by potentially relaxing the "Must Support" requirement.

Can the "mode" sub-element within the "Attester" element convey additional information?

The working group explored this possibility, but the limited options for "mode" values presented a challenge in conveying information like "as is" or unverified data.

What are the next steps in deciding how to handle the "Attester" element?

A change proposal regarding the "Attester" element will be put forward for further discussion and disposition in upcoming sessions, with participants encouraged to continue the discussion in forums.

Decisions:

Decision Item #	Decision Item
1	Decision deferred to the ballot disposition process, with discussions on Attester implementation differences and the "Must Support" requirement to be finalized in February's working group meetings.

Action Items:

Action Item #	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
1	Attend the JIRA webinar on Tuesday, February 6th, at 12 PM ET to learn about navigating JIRA for tracking, submitting, and documenting feedback. Note: This will affect future ballot cycles, not the current one.	Working group members	February 6, 2024	In Progress

Action Item #	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
2	Attend the next working group meeting for February 13, 2024, from 1-2pm ET	Working group members	February 13, 2024	In Progress
3	Infoway to document and present the recommendation for the Attester data element, as discussed in the January 30th PSWG meeting, during the ballot disposition review period.	Infoway	February 22, 2024	In Progress
4	Attend upcoming disposition period meetings on February 22nd and 27th to review ballot feedback and discuss proposed changes like removing the "Must Support" requirement for Attester.	Working group members	February 27, 2024	In Progress