

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 11, 2025, 1:00pm – 2:00pm ET	Virtual	Sadrina Petit, Project Analyst, Digital Health Interoperability	March 18, 2025, 1:00pm-2:00pm ET
Meeting Agenda: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pan-Canadian Projectathon Recap 2. PS-CA v2.1.0 DFT-Ballot Development Timelines and Ballot Cycle 3. CA:FeX Education Session 4. Next Steps 			
Presenters			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allana Cameron, Senior Product Manager, PS-CA • Sonia Balgah, Senior Business Analyst, PS-CA • Edmond Chiu, Senior Software Developer 			
Invited Guests			
Public			

1. Welcome and Introductions

S. Balgah welcomed all participants to the working group meeting and introduced Allana Cameron, and Edmond Chiu. 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 included a brief discussion about ballot cycle timelines and a recap of the recent Projectathon/Plugathon. The main focus was an education session on CA: FeX, covering what CA: FeX is, its purpose, how it's used in practice, and its relationship to other specifications.

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:

Are you already using FHIR RESTful APIs for data exchange?

- Josh (Identos):
Yes, we successfully used CA:FeX at the Connectathons for exchanging patient summaries between Ontario, BC, and Washington State.
- Monief (Hajj use case):
Yes, we're currently implementing RESTful APIs for patient data exchange in our middleware for the upcoming Hajj pilgrimage, connecting multiple countries' health data.
- Carly (Verosource):
Yes, we actively use FHIR APIs in multiple projects and had no significant difficulty adapting our APIs to implement CA:FeX for the Projectathon.

What was it like for your team to implement CA:FeX for the Projectathon?

- Josh (Identos):
Implementation was straightforward, and we managed to set up and test efficiently ahead of time. It was a very positive and successful experience.

Having implemented CA:FeX, what does this mean moving forward for Identos?

- Josh (Identos):
We're currently reflecting internally about next steps. Our positive experience at the Connectathon has encouraged us to consider deeper engagement with Pan-Canadian interoperability initiatives.

Was it challenging to implement CA:FeX on top of your existing FHIR APIs?

- Carly (Verosource):
No, it required minimal effort and adaptation. Implementing CA:FeX use cases on our existing APIs was straightforward and manageable.

Are the proposed next steps (increasing CA:FeX awareness, aligning with international standards like IPA, refining technical capability statements) appropriate and valuable?

- Group consensus:
Yes, the group supported these proposed next steps, emphasizing increased clarity, flexibility, and alignment with international interoperability standards.

How are CA:FeX and Halo related?

CA: FeX focuses on standardizing clinical data exchange through FHIR APIs, while Halo provides a platform primarily for launching SMART-on-FHIR applications. They complement each other; Halo can leverage CA: FeX for data exchange, but CA:FeX isn't directly built into Halo.

Should CA: FeX prioritize alignment with IPA or QEDm?

Alignment with international standards like IPA is valuable because it reduces implementation costs and promotes consistency. Aligning with QEDm currently has limited value, as it's expected to be restructured around IPA soon.

Are IPA, US Core, and QEDm at the same architectural level as CA: FeX?

No. CA:FeX mainly addresses API interactions, whereas standards like US Core, AU Core, and QEDm are more profile oriented. IPA focuses on standardized international API operations.

What are the practical challenges of using \$everything?

Using \$everything can be challenging due to complex authorization requirements and the high volume of data it produces, which can be difficult and costly for servers to implement and clients to manage effectively.