

Building Blocks Working Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Summary

<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Note Taker</u>	<u>Next Meeting Date</u>
Thursday, August 22, 2024, 1:00pm-2:00PM ET	Virtual	Sadrina Petit, Project Analyst, Digital Health Interoperability	Thursday, August 29, 2024, 1:00pm-2:00PM ET
Meeting Agenda: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Queries / Capability Statements 2. CA:CSD iGuide 			
Presenters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean Matthews – Service Directory, Product Owner • Irfan Hakim - Functional & Industry Consultant Data & AI 			
Invited Guests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public 			

1. Welcome and Introductions

D. Matthews 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. In the meeting, we reviewed queries, capability statements, and CA:CSD iGuide.

- The summary and presentation are available [here](#)
- The video recording is [here](#)
- The transcripts are [here](#)

3. Questions raised during the working group meeting

What are the main options for aligning capability statements between NCSC and MCSD?

1. **Update Support Elements:** Align with MCSD by adding more must-support elements.
2. **Use Obligations** (Recommended): Maintain compliance with MCSD using obligations without setting new must-support elements.

3. **Change Shalls to Shoulds:** Modify capability statements to "shoulds" to maintain capabilities, potentially affecting direct compliance with MCSD.

How can local changes to the guide be demonstrated before public release?

Local changes, like the ones demonstrated by Ifan using a local IG Publisher setup, are previewed to show how the guide would incorporate obligations without extending must-support requirements. These are not in the public guide yet but are shown to provide a concept of the proposed updates.

What is the implication of changing "shalls" to "shoulds" in capability statements?

Changing from "shalls" to "shoulds" in capability statements can reduce the strictness of compliance requirements, allowing more flexibility in implementation. However, this might compromise direct compliance with MCSD standards, which could be critical depending on regulatory or operational requirements.

How do obligations interact with capability statements in the context of queries?

Obligations can be used to specify conditions under which certain elements must be supported, without making them mandatory across all implementations. This approach helps maintain compliance with broader standards while allowing for flexibility in how data elements are supported or queried based on actual use cases.

What are the real-world impacts of implementing extensive query capabilities as discussed?

The requirement to support extensive queries, as per some capability statements, can lead to significant development effort, especially when the use cases for such queries are limited or not aligned with customer needs. This raises concerns about the practicality and efficiency of implementing such requirements, potentially leading to unnecessary complexity in systems.

How can we handle discrepancies between profiling element requirements and query expectations?

The discussion highlighted a gap in how profiling requirements and query capabilities are aligned. There is a need for clearer guidelines and perhaps revisions in the standards to ensure that query capabilities and element support requirements are effectively synchronized, reflecting both compliance needs and practical usage scenarios.

What considerations should be taken into account when deciding which search parameters to support?

The choice of search parameters should be based on the specific use cases that are relevant to your application. Unnecessary parameters that do not support your operational needs or that add complexity without adding value should be avoided. It is also important to consider the setup of your server, as this can dictate which parameters are feasible or necessary to implement.

Do patient directory applications need to support the same search parameters as referral applications?

No, patient directory applications do not necessarily need to support all the search parameters that a referral application does, and vice versa. The requirements should be tailored to meet the specific functionalities and purposes of each type of application.

What should be done if certain search parameters are deemed proprietary or sensitive?

If certain information, such as organization affiliation, is considered proprietary or sensitive, it should be carefully evaluated before being included as a searchable parameter. Consider the implications of exposing such information and whether it aligns with privacy policies and the intended use of the directory.

How should feedback be handled regarding the implementation of search parameters?

Establish a feedback mechanism to gather insights from users on the utility and effectiveness of implemented search parameters. This feedback can guide future revisions and help ensure that the parameters meet practical needs without imposing unnecessary burdens.

How should 'shall able to populate' be applied to search parameters?

The 'shall able to populate' directive should be applied with caution. It indicates a strong expectation that, if you claim conformance to the guide, you can support these parameters. However, this does not mean that every parameter must always be used; it should be contextually appropriate and based on actual data usage needs.

What is the current status of the guide update?

The goal is to have all content for the guide completed by next week due to the upcoming ballot lockdown. This is an important deadline to ensure all updates are reviewed and incorporated in time.

How can I provide feedback on the guide updates?

If you have a JIRA login, you can create tickets directly in our CSD JIRA project for any feedback or issues you find. For those without a JIRA login, instructions for obtaining one are available on last week's call summary and on the website under the Simplifier guide section. Feedback can also be submitted through the provided links in the presentation deck or directly on the website's feedback section.

What new content has been added to the guide?

New guidance has been added around ID identifiers, the use of operational parameters, and phone numbers. This content focuses on the elements within their respective resources, with additional comments and guidance still being worked on. Updates also include links to the profiles derived from MCSD, references made, as well as the scope and usage of each profile.

Are there any examples provided in the guide for better understanding?

Yes, query examples have been created and will be added to the guide. Resource examples for each of the resources mentioned in the RFP will also be included to provide practical insights and applications.

What should I do if I find issues with the guide or have suggestions?

You should post your feedback through the JIRA ticket system if you have access, or use the feedback link provided in the deck and on the website. If you encounter any difficulties or have specific requests or suggestions, you can also comment through forums or reach out directly via the contacts provided to ensure your input is considered.

4. Links shared during the meeting

- <https://profiles.ihe.net/ITI/TF/Volume2/ch-Z.html#z.10-profiling-conventions-for-constraints-on-fhir>