

eReferral Working Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Summary

Meeting Chair: Alex Reis			
<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Note Taker</u>	<u>Next Meeting Date</u>
Wednesday, January 10, 2023, 1:00pm - 02:00pm ET	Virtual	Sadrina Petit, Project Analyst, Digital Health Interoperability	January 24, 2024, 1:00pm-2:00PM ET
Meeting Agenda: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Definition of Must Support 2. Items in the scope of Release 1 			
Presenters			
Mark Fernandes – eReferral / eConsult Product Owner			
Invited Guests			
Public			

1. Welcome and Introductions

M. Fernandes welcomed all participants to the working group meeting. 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 this meeting was on discussing the definition of 'Must Support' and items within the scope for Release 1.

The presentation is available: [eReferral Working Group Meeting](#)

The video recording is available: [eReferral Working Group Meeting](#)

3. Questions raised during the working group meeting:

What is the definition of 'Must Support' agreed on by the working group?

The working group agreed to look through the application of 'Must Support' within the profiles to determine a final definition for the implementation guide. The current working definition is:

Sender

Elements marked with the "MustSupport" flag SHALL be populated as specified within the profile they belong to if available and appropriate.

Elements without the "MustSupport" flag SHOULD still be populated, however carry no expectations in the Implementation guide.

Receiver

Receivers SHALL be capable of processing resource instances containing data elements populated with the “MustSupport” flag without generating an error or causing the application to fail. Elements without a “MustSupport” flag in a FHIR response SHOULD still be received without generating an error or causing the application to fail - The receiver SHOULD be capable of displaying “MustSupport” data elements for human use or processing (including, storing them) for multiple events.

It is important to have a consistent definition between all pan-Canadian products (e.g. PS-CA, CA-Core+, etc.).

Why do we need to add the ‘as available and appropriate’ clause for sender systems sending data with ‘Must Support’ elements?

For certain jurisdictions, including ‘Must Support’ on data that cannot be provided due to limited authority to collect, and considered data breaches if sent, would make the application of ‘Must Support’ to data elements very limited without the additional clause.

What elements need ‘Must Support’ applied at minimum in the FHIR implementation guide?

The use of ‘Must Support’ for data elements that support the FHIR messaging workflow and state machines to progress the referral order at minimum was described.

What is not included in the first release, and why?

The first release excludes components like SMART-on-FHIR flows, guidance around the service directory and HealthcareService profile, Consent profile, and profiles used for supporting information that would have jurisdictional variation and take more time and involvement from additional stakeholders to get consensus (Condition, Allergy Intolerance). The decision is based on focusing initially on crucial elements to support the FHIR messaging for the referral workflow to have a lean first release.

Is there a plan to create a separate service directory specification?

Yes, there is consideration for a separate pan-Canadian service directory specification to facilitate a lookup service for users to find referral services. The specification should cover both direct-to-provider and central intake models.

Should the service directory be discussed in the same meeting or as part of a separate working group?

The working group has indicated desire to have discussions about the pan-Canadian service directory within a separate working group.

How are Healthcare Service profiles handled in future releases?

HealthcareService profiles will be addressed in future releases and possibly referenced from a separate implementation guide for service directories.

What are the implications of updating canonical URLs, and how should vendors adapt to potential breaking changes?

The working group is discussing the implications of updating canonical URLs and is planning a future session to discuss the pros and cons. Vendors are encouraged to participate in these discussions.

Is the proposed frequency of working group meetings feasible for all jurisdictions?

There are concerns about the frequency of working group meetings and the pace that feedback is requested, as certain jurisdictions are not able to provide meaningful feedback due to other priorities.

Should there be a consideration for extending the release timelines to allow for more thoughtful feedback and collaboration?

The working group will rely on the open review process for feedback on the for-ballot release, with the assurance that it is a draft specification, not ready for trial/production implementations.

Decisions

Decision Item #	Decision Item
1	The working group would start with the proposed "working definition" for the pan-Canadian eReferral specification and refine the definition as profiles with 'Must Support' elements undergo due diligence review through the balloting process.
2	Prioritize core elements crucial for supporting referral workflows and messaging in the initial release. Exclude certain clinical profiles and guidance for a lean first ballot release.
3	Establish a dedicated working group to define the pan-Canadian service directory specification. Ensure collaboration to develop a comprehensive and effective directory.

Action Items

Action Item #	Action Item	Responsible	Due Date	Status
1	Schedule the next working group meeting for January 24, 2024	Infoway	January 11, 2024	Completed
2	Discuss the approach to refine the definition of "Must Support" during the balloting process.	Infoway/ Working Group	January 24, 2024	In Progress
3	Discuss proposed profile changes and rationale for <i>Patient</i> and <i>Communication</i> profiles.	Infoway/ Working Group	February 7, 2024	In Progress
4	Set the meeting agenda based on feedback received through forums to ensure relevance and responsiveness.	Infoway	January 23, 2024	In Progress
5	Present to the working group how JIRA will be utilized to manage the issue tracking and feedback process moving forward. Concurrently, set up a JIRA board to track and document issues and feedback raised by the working group.	Infoway	February 6, 2024	In Progress