



**HL7 CDA® R2 Implementation Guide:**  
**Personal Advance Care Plan (PACP) Document**  
**Release 1 – US Realm**

May 2022

**HL7 STU Ballot**

**Volume 1 - introductory and background material**

**Sponsored by:**  
**Structured Documents Work Group**  
**Patient Care Work Group**

Copyright © 2021-2022 Health Level Seven International ® ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. The reproduction of this material in any form is strictly forbidden without the written permission of the publisher. HL7 and Health Level Seven are registered trademarks of Health Level Seven International. Reg. U.S. Pat & TM Off.

Use of this material is governed by HL7's [IP Compliance Policy](#).

**IMPORTANT NOTES:**

HL7 licenses its standards and select IP free of charge. **If you did not acquire a free license from HL7 for this document**, you are not authorized to access or make any use of it. To obtain a free license, please visit <http://www.HL7.org/implement/standards/index.cfm>.

**If you are the individual that obtained the license for this HL7 Standard, specification or other freely licensed work (in each and every instance "Specified Material")**, the following describes the permitted uses of the Material.

**A. HL7 INDIVIDUAL, STUDENT AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS**, who register and agree to the terms of HL7's license, are authorized, without additional charge, to read, and to use Specified Material to develop and sell products and services that implement, but do not directly incorporate, the Specified Material in whole or in part without paying license fees to HL7.

INDIVIDUAL, STUDENT AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS wishing to incorporate additional items of Specified Material in whole or part, into products and services, or to enjoy additional authorizations granted to HL7 ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS as noted below, must become ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS of HL7.

**B. HL7 ORGANIZATION MEMBERS**, who register and agree to the terms of HL7's License, are authorized, without additional charge, on a perpetual (except as provided for in the full license terms governing the Material), non-exclusive and worldwide basis, the right to (a) download, copy (for internal purposes only) and share this Material with your employees and consultants for study purposes, and (b) utilize the Material for the purpose of developing, making, having made, using, marketing, importing, offering to sell or license, and selling or licensing, and to otherwise distribute, Compliant Products, in all cases subject to the conditions set forth in this Agreement and any relevant patent and other intellectual property rights of third parties (which may include members of HL7). No other license, sublicense, or other rights of any kind are granted under this Agreement.

**C. NON-MEMBERS**, who register and agree to the terms of HL7's IP policy for Specified Material, are authorized, without additional charge, to read and use the Specified Material for evaluating whether to implement, or in implementing, the Specified Material, and to use Specified Material to develop and sell products and services that implement, but do not directly incorporate, the Specified Material in whole or in part.

NON-MEMBERS wishing to incorporate additional items of Specified Material in whole or part, into products and services, or to enjoy the additional authorizations granted to HL7 ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS, as noted above, must become ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS of HL7.

Please see <http://www.HL7.org/legal/ippolicy.cfm> for the full license terms governing the Material.

**Ownership.** Licensee agrees and acknowledges that **HL7 owns** all right, title, and interest, in and to the Materials. Licensee shall **take no action contrary to, or inconsistent with**, the foregoing.

**Licensee agrees and acknowledges that HL7 may not own all right, title, and interest, in and to the Materials and that the Materials may contain and/or reference intellectual property owned by third parties ("Third Party IP"). Acceptance of these License Terms does not grant Licensee any rights with respect to Third Party IP. Licensee alone is responsible for identifying and obtaining any necessary licenses or authorizations to utilize Third Party IP in connection with the Materials or otherwise. Any actions, claims or suits brought by a third party resulting from a breach of any Third Party IP right by the Licensee remains the Licensee's liability.**

Following is a non-exhaustive list of third-party terminologies that may require a separate license:

Terminology	Owner/Contact
Current Procedures Terminology (CPT) code set	American Medical Association <a href="https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/cpt-licensing">https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/cpt-licensing</a>
SNOMED CT	SNOMED International <a href="http://www.snomed.org/snomed-ct/get-snomed-ct">http://www.snomed.org/snomed-ct/get-snomed-ct</a> or <a href="mailto:info@ihtsdo.org">info@ihtsdo.org</a>
Logical Observation Identifiers Names & Codes (LOINC)	Regenstrief Institute
International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes	World Health Organization (WHO)
NUCC Health Care Provider Taxonomy code set	American Medical Association. Please see <a href="http://www.nucc.org">www.nucc.org</a> . AMA licensing contact: 312-464-5022 (AMA IP services)

## Structure of This Guide

Two volumes comprise this *HL7 IG for CDA® Release 2: Personal Advance Care Plan*. Volume 1 provides narrative introductory and background material pertinent to this IG, including information on how to understand and use the templates documented in Volume 2. Volume 2 contains the normative Clinical Document Architecture (CDA) templates for this guide along with lists of all templates, code systems, value sets, and changes from the previous version.

## Acknowledgements

This CDA Implementation Guide has been developed by MaxMD under the management of HL7 as part of an industry initiative to establish a standard for sharing Advance Directive information for exchanging personal advance care plans between systems and users of this information. The guidance in the Personal Advance Care Plan Implementation Guide reflects implementation experience and input from healthcare community stakeholders, and feedback from surveys and in-person “Implementation-a-thons” conducted by HL7.

The project team wishes to extend its thanks to members of the HL7 Structured Documents Work Group, Patient Care Work Group, HL7 C-CDA Implementation-A-Thon participants and those who contributed to the development and review of guidance noted in this document:

Primary Editor/Co-Editor		
Lisa Nelson, MS, MBA		L. Scott Brown
Structured Documents Work Group Leadership		
Russell Ott	Gay Dolin MSN RN	Benjamin Flessner
Austin Kreisler	Sean McIlvenna	Andrew Statler
Matt Szczepankiewicz		
Patient Care Work Group Leadership		
Stephen Chu	Laura Heermann RN, PhD	Jay Lyle
Michelle Miler	Michael Padula MD, MBI	Emma Jones
Michael Tan		
PACP Content Contributors and Reviewers		
M'Lynda Owens, PhD, RN-BC, CHDA	David Tao, D.Sc.	Brian Scheller, MBA
Terrence A. O'Malley, MD	Judith R. Peres, LCSW-C	John F. Derr, RPh
Jeff Zucker	Ferdinan L. Mirarchi, D.O., FAAEM, FACEP	Rob Hausam
Joeseeph Schneider, MD	Rodolfo Alvarez del Castillo, MD	Michael Wasserman
Dan Morhaim	Remington Johnson	Dan Hanfling
Evelyn Gallego	Swapna Bhatia	Douglas Renfield-Miller
Maria Moen	Liz Palena Hall	Natasha Kreisle
Matt Elrod	Scott Brown	

# Contents

OPEN ISSUES.....	8
1 INTRODUCTION.....	9
1.1 Purpose.....	9
1.2 Prerequisite Information .....	10
1.3 Audience .....	10
1.4 Approach.....	10
1.5 Organization of the Guide .....	11
1.5.1 Volume 1 Introductory Material .....	11
1.5.2 Volume 2 CDA Templates and Supporting Material .....	11
2 BACKGROUND .....	13
2.1 What is the PACP document?.....	14
2.2 Why is digital exchange for advance care plan information needed?.....	15
2.3 Risk mitigation for common digital exchange issues?.....	15
2.4 What are the envisioned Use Cases? .....	16
3 DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS .....	17
3.1 Functional and content requirements for PACP documents.....	17
3.2 Support for multiple levels of machine readability .....	18
3.2.1 Benefits of PACP unstructured CDA document exchange.....	20
3.2.2 Benefits of PACP Level Two CDA document exchange .....	21
3.2.3 Benefits of PACP Level Three CDA document exchange.....	23
3.3 Required relationship between human readable information and machine readable information.....	25
3.4 Information relationships with other C-CDA information exchange artifacts.....	27
3.5 Use of coded questions in machine readable entries .....	32
3.6 Use of nested sections in a PACP document .....	33
3.7 Overview of header data elements in the context of a PACP document.....	34
3.8 Assertion of template conformance for instance validation and interoperability .....	36
4 USING THIS IG .....	39
4.1 Conformance Conventions Used in This Guide .....	39
4.1.1 Templates and Conformance Statements .....	39
4.1.2 Template Versioning.....	41
4.1.3 Open and Closed Templates.....	42
4.1.4 Conformance Verbs (Keywords).....	43

4.1.5	Cardinality .....	44
4.1.6	Optional and Required with Cardinality .....	44
4.1.7	Containment Relationships.....	45
4.1.8	Vocabulary Conformance.....	45
4.1.9	Data Types .....	47
4.1.10	Document-Level Templates "Properties" Heading.....	47
4.2	XML Conventions Used in This Guide .....	47
4.2.1	XPath Notation.....	47
4.2.2	XML Examples and Sample Documents .....	48
5	REFERENCES .....	49
	Appendix A: Format Codes .....	50
	Appendix B: Extensions to CDA R2 .....	51
	Appendix C: Coded Content Crosswalk.....	52

## Figures

Figure 1: Unstructured PACP – Embedded.....	20
Figure 2: Unstructured PACP – Referenced .....	20
Figure 3: Level Two CDA PACP Document.....	22
Figure 4: Level Three CDA PACP Document .....	24
Figure 5: Translation of Prior Care Plan Diagram .....	28
Figure 6: Information Relationships: Clinical Summary to PACP document .....	29
Figure 7: Information Relationship: Care Plan to PACP .....	30
Figure 8: Information Relationships: Combined View .....	31
Figure 9: Constraint Conformance Including "such that it" Syntax Example .....	41
Figure 10: Constraints Format – only one allowed.....	44
Figure 11: Constraints Format – only one like this allowed.....	44
Figure 12: Constraints Format – none like this allowed .....	44
Figure 13: Binding to a Single Code.....	46
Figure 14: XML Expression of a Single-Code Binding.....	46
Figure 15: Translation Code Example .....	46
Figure 16: XML Document Example .....	48
Figure 17: XPath Expression Example .....	48

## Tables

Table 1: Definition of CDA Levels from the HL7 CDA R2 standard. ....	19
Table 2: PACP Sub-Section Design .....	34
Table 3: PACP Header Element Constraints .....	35
Table 4: Contexts Table Example—Allergy Concern Act (V2) .....	40
Table 5: Constraints Overview Example—Allergy Concern Act (V2) .....	40
Table 6: Change Log for Versioned Templates .....	42
Table 7: Example Value Set Table (Referral Types) .....	47
Table 8: Crosswalk between PACP Entry Types and Advance Directive Observation Types .....	52

## OPEN ISSUES

1.	To align with the FHIR Advance Directives IG, should there be a value set on precondition for the criterion code? (See <a href="https://jira.hl7.org/browse/CDA-20323">https://jira.hl7.org/browse/CDA-20323</a> )
2.	CDA-20016 has not been resolved to add Witness and Notary terms to the Personal and Legal Relationship ValueSet. (See <a href="https://jira.hl7.org/browse/CDA-20016">https://jira.hl7.org/browse/CDA-20016</a> )
3.	In Section 3.3 Required relationship between human readable information and machine readable information, consider removing “To ensure the integrity of the information within a PACP document and as part of the approach taken in this IG to address the risks associated with processing discrete data (see section 3.2.3), the document <b>SHALL</b> include valid text linking between all machine processable clinical statements and the associated human readable information intended to convey the same meaning.” This constraint within Vol 1 would be replaced by constraints on all appropriate templates in Vol 2.
4.	Consider removing Vol 1 information that is outdated or less relevant for CDA IG’s.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose

This two-volume implementation guide (IG) defines the CDA R2 based templates for representing Personal Advance Care Plan (PACP) documents. It describes the document design and its envisioned use in information exchange (Volume 1). It contains a library of CDA templates applicable to the US Realm which can be applied to the HL7 CDA R2 standard to facilitate creation, validation, and consumption of information in the PACP format (Volume 2).

The terms in the name have been selected to communicate five key characteristics about this type of information exchange artifact:

1. **Personal** – While most other information in a care plan may be prepared by clinicians, this information is authored by the individual, possibly with the assistance of family, caregivers, or healthcare agents. It expresses his or her personal goals, preferences and priorities for medical treatments.
2. **Advance** – The information is prospective. It is generated in advance of when it may be needed under certain emergency or critical care situations, or in circumstances associated with severely debilitating illness.
3. **Care** – The information expresses the individual's plan for his or her care and medical treatments. It includes information that is relevant and pertinent for care planning.
4. **Plan** – The information that the document presents is a plan in that it addresses a course of action to be carried out or goals to be accomplished in the future.
5. **Document** – The information follows the document metaphor and document principles established by the HL7 Clinical Document Architecture standard.

The term “advance directive” in this IG does not refer to a specific form, document, or method of memorializing advance healthcare decisions, but is instead an overarching term used to describe all types of advance directive information. Advance directive information can be organized into three distinct categories. The HL7 FHIR PACIO Advance Directive Interoperability Implementation Guide defines these three categories as:

Content Type 1: Person-Authored Advance Directive Information,

Content Type 2: Encounter-Centric Documentation of existing Patient Care Goals and Treatment preferences and Current Instructions (obligations and prohibitions). and

Content Type 3: Portable Medical Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment.

This IG focuses on defining a standard representation for Type 1 Content.

For additional information on Type 2 Encounter-Centric Documentation of existing Patient Care Goals and Treatment preferences and Current Instructions (obligations and prohibitions) please reference HL7 CDA® R2 Implementation Guide: C-CDA R2.1 Supplemental Templates for Advance Directives, Release 1, STU2 - US Realm. For additional information on Type 3 Advance Directive content, please see HL7 CDA R2

Implementation Guide: ePOLST: Portable Medical Orders About Resuscitation and Initial Treatment.

This version of the IG does not define any additional templates. Modifications have been made to align this work with additional advance directive data exchange standardization taking place in the HL7 FHIR PACIO Advance Directive Interoperability Implementation Guide and HL7 CDA R2 Implementation Guide: ePOLST: Portable Medical Orders About Resuscitation and Initial Treatment and clarify how this guidance fits in with the entire body of advance directive data exchange guidance being developed within HL7.

## **1.2 Prerequisite Information**

Readers of this implementation guide should first read the HL7 FHIR PACIO Advance Directive Interoperability Implementation Guide.

For guidance on the use of CDA to exchange, share and retrieve Type 2 Content, reference HL7 CDA® R2 Implementation Guide: C-CDA R2.1 Supplemental Templates for Advance Directives, Release 1, STU2 - US Realm to facilitate exchange, sharing, and retrieval of Encounter-Centric Documentation of existing Patient Care Goals and Treatment preferences and Current Instructions.

For guidance on exchanging, sharing and retrieving advance directive information for Type 3 (practitioner-authored) Advance Directive Information using CDA, readers should consult the current version HL7 CDA R2 Implementation Guide: ePOLST: Portable Medical Orders About Resuscitation and Initial Treatment

## **1.3 Audience**

The audience for this IG includes implementers creating CDA encounter summary and patient summary documents that include personal advance care plan information. The IG also is relevant to system architects and developers of healthcare information technology (HIT) systems in the US Realm that exchange clinical and non-clinical data. Business analysts and policy managers also benefit from gaining a basic understanding of the advance directive information use cases addressed by the IG. Finally, Quality Reporting Agencies, Standards Development Organizations (SDOs), Payors, Providers and Patients will benefit from this IG as it explains information representation details that are valuable when designing quality measures and expanding coded vocabularies.

## **1.4 Approach**

Implementation Guidance for creation of a PACP document has been developed to align and be consistent with guidance and CDA templates established within the HL7 Consolidated CDA Release 2.1 IG.

Some of the content in this IG is similar to information in C-CDA, but has been further constrained. Other information has been created specifically for this IG.

## 1.5 Organization of the Guide

This IG is organized into two volumes. Volume 1 contains material describing the context for creation and use of a PACP document. Volume 2 contains CDA template definitions.

### 1.5.1 Volume 1 Introductory Material

Volume 1 provides overview and background information that forms a context for understanding the purpose of a PACP document.

- **Chapter 1**—Introduction.
- **Chapter 2**—Background. This chapter contains background information about the information exchange needs and requirements addressed by the PACP document.
- **Chapter 3**—Design Considerations. This chapter includes design considerations that are addressed by the PACP document templates. It includes additional information and narrative guidance about how to use the templates defined in Volume 2 of this IG.
- **Chapter 4**—Using This IG. This chapter describes the rules and formalisms used to constrain the CDA R2 standard. It describes the formal representation of CDA templates, the mechanism by which templates are bound to vocabulary, and additional information necessary to understand and correctly implement the normative content found in Volume 2 of this IG.
- **Appendices.** The Appendices include a list of key acronyms, a high-level change log, a summary of extensions to CDA R2, a reference copy of the appendix for the Care Plan explanatory material from the C-CDA Guide, and a crosswalk between the coding specified for content in the PACP document and the coding defined in C-CDA R2.1 for summarizing different types of advance directive and advance care plan information that a person may have documented.

### 1.5.2 Volume 2 CDA Templates and Supporting Material

Volume 2 includes CDA templates and prescribes their use for a set of specific document types. The main chapters are as follows:

- **Chapter 1**—Document-Level Templates. This chapter defines the US Realm Document and Header templates for the PACP document.
- **Chapter 2**—Section-Level Templates. This chapter defines the section templates referenced within the document template. A section template may contain other templated patterns within its design. Section templates can be reused by future specifications.
- **Chapter 3**—Entry-Level Templates. This chapter defines entry-level templates referenced within the section templates of this document. Entry-level templates are called clinical statements. They are used to encode information from a section of the document as machine processable data. Entry-level templates are always contained in section-level templates, and section-level templates are always contained in a document. Entry-level templates establish an allowable

clinical statement pattern. An entry-level template may contain other templated patterns within its design. They can be reused by future specifications.

- **Chapter 4**—Template Ids in this IG.
- **Chapter 5**—Value Sets in this IG.
- **Chapter 6**—Code Systems in this IG.
- **Chapter 7**—Changes from previous versions.

## 2 BACKGROUND

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there are approximately 145.6 million emergency department visits every year in the United States. Many of the individuals visiting emergency departments are unable to communicate when they arrive due to their injuries or illness. In addition, a full 40% of adult medical inpatients are incapable of making medical treatment decisions. 44-69% of nursing home residents cannot make their own medical treatment decisions. The vast majority of critically ill people cannot participate directly in decision-making. Each of these situations would be an appropriate use case for documents that help the person in question to express his or her goals, preferences and priorities for medical treatments.

The documents that people have traditionally used to express their medical treatment wishes have been broadly termed “advance medical directives,” or commonly called, “advance directives.” Advance medical directives typically consist of two documents – the “living will,” and the “medical power of attorney.” A living will usually tells medical personnel whether a person wants “life-sustaining treatments” (e.g., artificial nutrition or hydration, dialysis or the use of a ventilator to help with breathing) should that person suffer a medical emergency and be unable to communicate with the care team. A person uses a medical power of attorney to appoint one or more people to serve as advocates or “healthcare agents” empowered to make medical treatment decisions on behalf of the person if he or she is incapacitated and cannot communicate with medical providers. Finally, in some jurisdictions, organ donation forms and do-not-resuscitate orders are other forms of advance medical directives.

Published research indicates that, since their introduction in 1967, advance directives have done little to prove that they are an effective tool to either improve the quality of care or to reduce the costs associated with that care. According to an August 2008 report titled, Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Report to Congress on Advance Directives and Advance Care Planning, and a report titled, Dying in America: Improving Quality and Honoring Individual Preferences Near the End of Life, issued by the Institute of Medicine in September 2014, too few people have advance directives; when directives exist, they are inaccessible; and even when they can be located and retrieved, most advance directives are of poor quality (e.g., ambiguous or not actionable) and of little or no value to the care team.

As a result of the experienced shortcomings associated with what the American Bar Association, Commission on Law and Aging has termed the “legal transactional approach” to protecting patient wishes regarding medical treatments (i.e., a focus on the formal steps of implementing standardized, “legalistic” statutory forms to direct or delegate healthcare decisions in advance of decisional incapacity), an alternative paradigm has emerged – a communications or “advance care planning” approach that focuses on process and content over the completion and signature, witnessing and/or notarization of a legal form. The content that results from the advance care planning processes is generally (and appropriately) referred to as an “advance care plan.”

The evolution towards advance care planning and advance care plans, however, only partially solves the problem of protecting individual goals, preferences, and priorities with respect to medical treatments. Published peer-reviewed literature, as well as expert testimony before Congress and the Office of the National Coordinator of Health Information Technology, has revealed that advance care planning currently begins too

late in the continuum of care, when individuals are already suffering from severely debilitating illness and possibly even close to the end of their lives. Also, as mentioned above, researchers have found that still too few people have advance care plans, and even when those plans exist, they are almost never accessible when and where needed. Finally, the wide range of terms used to describe different concepts in advance care planning and advance directives (e.g., “healthcare agent” vs. “medical proxy”) makes it difficult for families and caregivers living in different parts of the country to engage in meaningful, important healthcare conversations.

Thought leaders and healthcare policymakers have taken note of the need to address these issues. In its September 2014 report, the IOM committee states, “Electronic storage of advance directives, statements of wishes, health care proxies, or other relevant materials – either in the person’s electronic health record or an external database – holds promise for solving some current problems with these documents.” In Objective 6 of its Meaningful Use Stage 3 final rule with comment period published in the Federal Register on October 16, 2015, HHS also called for improvements in care coordination through patient engagement, specifically calling out the incorporation of patient generated and/or non-clinical data such as the information included in advance directives as a means for providers to satisfy Measure 3 of that objective.

As attitudes toward advance directives and advance care plans change, and as the healthcare industry’s focus shifts to center on the goals, preferences, and priorities of the individual, exchange of a standards-based, digital document may be critical to allow people to share their personal advance care plan information.

It’s possible that the advance care plan information shared via the PACP document will be helpful not only when people cannot speak for themselves, but also when they can. The literature shows that people are frequently reluctant to verbally state their wishes. A standard exchange document may help to increase the likelihood that patients and providers have verbal conversations about this topic because patients would have clarified their goals, preferences and priorities while recording the information contained in the document. Also, providers, having exposure to their patients’ documented wishes, would be more aware of discordance between care plans and personal wishes, which would prompt further discussion.

## **2.1 What is the PACP document?**

The PACP document is a CDA document template designed to share information created by an individual to express his or her care and medical treatment goals, preferences, and priorities for some future point in time, under certain circumstances when the individual cannot make medical treatment decisions or communicate his or her goals, preferences, and priorities with the care team.

Within the family of documents that have been defined under Consolidated CDA, the PACP document can be classified as a type of Patient Generated Document. The PACP document facilitates digital exchange of information previously and currently captured and shared using paper documents. It may include information relating to any or all of the following: the person authoring the advance care plan; appointed healthcare agents and their powers and limitations; goals, preferences, and priorities for care (e.g., palliative and/or hospice care) and medical treatment at the end of life (e.g., attempts at resuscitation) or following death (e.g., organ donation and autopsy); other personal

goals, preferences, and priorities relevant to care planning; and information about who has signed, witnessed, and notarized the information authored by the individual, if available and appropriate.

## **2.2 Why is digital exchange for advance care plan information needed?**

Digital information exchange standards are needed to support within the emerging HIT ecosystem sharing of information generated by a patient or person involved in care activities directly or indirectly. Systems that create and manage patient-centered care plans need a standardized means for individuals to share information about their care and medical treatment goals, preferences, and priorities in order to support a patient-mediated process.

Individuals need a way to generate information about their care goals, preferences and priorities so that their wishes will be considered when providers create and update their care plan.

Enabling interoperable exchange of this information makes it more possible (and likely) that a person's care plan will be centered on the person's goals, preferences and priorities.

## **2.3 Risk mitigation for common digital exchange issues?**

When locating and retrieving digital documentation, there are challenges that must be addressed. These challenges exist for digital exchange of all types of documents and thus are relevant and need to be considered when exchanging PACP documents.

1. Patient matching challenges. When a unique identifier is not available to reliably match patients across disparate systems, consideration must be given to metadata fields that will be used to support reliable patient matching. Systems such as Master Patient Index solutions can be used to minimize risks associated with identifying patients accurately.

2. Authorization to access the needed information. Business and technical processes are needed to determine and support information access that is appropriate and allowed given the considerations governing access to the information. These processes must address authorization from the declarant seeking to access the information and internal processes that control allowable authorization from inside an information source organization.

3. Authentication. Business and technical mechanisms are also needed to mitigate risks associated with establishing and confirming the identity associated with a person/system seeking to access patient information. All systems need policies and procedures to address this issue. Adherence to High Trust Information Security standards is a common level of adherence to best practices.

There also are risks associated with automated processing of coded data that may or may not fully capture the semantics of the associated information. Links between the narrative and coded clinical data are not sufficient to overcome this risk. This IG employs an approach to data representation that only codes questions used to determine a patient's care preferences under certain potential future situations. The

answers to those questions are never coded. This ensures human intervention to understand and apply the information as input to care planning. This approach reduces the potential risk of machine processing of discretely coded data.

## **2.4 What are the envisioned Use Cases?**

The purpose for exchange of PACP documents is to support person-centered emergency, critical and advance care planning. A system supporting the person who is authoring his or her advance care plan information would be acting as the Content Creator to create or update the PACP document. A system supporting a clinician or care team member who is authorized to review the advance care plan information would be acting as the Content Consumer to view, import, and/or consume content represented in the PACP document. The Content Creator and Content Consumer roles are technical roles that could be played by a PHR, an EHR, or any other system that fulfills the functional capabilities of creating or consuming the PACP document.

For use cases describing the exchange of patient authored advance directive information (Advance Directives Content Type 1) refer to the HL7 FHIR PACIO Advance Directive Interoperability Implementation Guide.



## 3 DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter describes the overall design for the PACP document. The design considerations are organized to do the following:

1. Describe the functional requirements to be addressed by information shared in the defined document.
2. Explain how the document template design supports multiple levels of information exchanged and why all levels of exchange are valuable when sharing PACP documents.
3. Explain why the PACP document establishes tighter conformance requirements between a section's human readable text and the associated machine-readable entries.
4. Show how the design of the PACP document relates to the design of other C-CDA document types.
5. Explain why the entry-level templates used in a PACP document utilize standardized questions where possible and do not constrain the associated answers.
6. Explain why the PACP document uses nested sections when a structured body is used.
7. Describe standard roles and events populated in a CDA document header as they pertain to the PACP document.
8. Assertion of template conformance for instance validation and interoperability.

### 3.1 **Functional and content requirements for PACP documents**

A PACP document needs to address, at a minimum, the following information sharing purposes:

1. Communicate choices and instructions to guide healthcare agent(s), including potential limitations on “standard” powers granted to healthcare agents.
2. Communicate goals, preferences, and priorities for medical treatments and care (including palliative care and/or hospice care) that are typically found in living wills and similar documents.
3. Communicate goals, preferences, and priorities following death, such as organ donation, autopsy, burial or funeral plans, etc.
4. Communicate other care planning goals, preferences, and priorities (e.g., attend daughter's wedding, die at home, messages for caregivers, likes and dislikes).
5. Communicate whether the individual reserves or waives the right to change all of his/her goals, preferences, and priorities, even if he/she is later determined to be legally incompetent (because some jurisdictions allow for this).
6. Identify with whom advance care plan information can be shared.
7. Create and share advance care plan information with others.

8. Update and share newer versions of personal advance care plan information with others.
9. Request and access the current version of a person's PACP document in a healthcare emergency or a critical care situation if the person cannot make medical treatment decisions or communicate with the care team.
10. Request and access the current version of a person's PACP document in a situation that is not a healthcare emergency or a critical care situation, and where the person is able to make medical treatment decisions and communicate with the care team.

A PACP document needs to specify how implementers can express the following types of content:

1. Information used to identify and contact healthcare agent(s), as well as choices and instructions relevant to the healthcare agent's powers and limitations.
2. Personal goals, preferences, and priorities relevant for emergency, critical and end-of-life care and medical treatment decisions (including palliative care and/or hospice care).
3. Personal goals, preferences, and priorities pertinent following death, such as organ donation, autopsy, burial or funeral plans, etc.
4. Personal care planning goals, preferences, and priorities which may be relevant for care and treatment decisions but not specific to emergency, critical or end-of-life care (e.g. attend daughter's wedding, die at home, messages for caregivers, likes and dislikes).
5. Indication of whether the individual reserves or waives the right to change all of his/her goals, preferences, and priorities, even if he/she is later determined to be legally incompetent (because some jurisdictions allow for this).
6. Information to identify individuals and/or entities with whom advance care plan information is being shared.
7. Information to identify the entity responsible for maintaining original personal advance care plan information and digital instances of that information created for sharing with others.
8. Information needed to identify versions of personal advance care plan information as it existed and was saved or shared over time.
9. Information that shows the purpose for which personal advance care planning information was shared.

### **3.2 Support for multiple levels of machine readability**

The design of the PACP document supports three different levels of machine readability. It allows for the exchange of an unstructured document, a Level Two CDA document, or a Level Three CDA document. As health information exchange of patient-generated information transitions from paper-based to digital sharing mechanisms, a gradual transition will need to be supported.

The PACP document standard supports multiple levels of machine readability so that implementers can gradually and incrementally improve the level of machine readability supported in data sharing documents as consensus around the representation of patient-generated data grows. The costs and challenges of encoding information for higher levels of machine readability also need to be weighed against the benefits. Further, findings from a study of the quality and variability of C-CDA documents produced by Meaningful Use Stage 2 Certified EHRs published in the Journal of American Medical Informatics Association in 2014 suggest that many EHR systems are not yet able to produce CDA documents of the quality required to support semantically interoperable data exchange.<sup>1</sup> While exchange of fully machine readable CDAs may be a future aim, exchange of human readable information in CDA documents is attainable today. The PACP document is specified to support multiple levels of machine readability so as to meet the needs of an evolutionary approach to adoption.

As background, implementers need to understand there are four kinds of HL7 CDA templates: (1) those that constrain the header and body of the document (document-level templates); (2) those that constrain the sections used to make up the body of a document (section-level templates); (3) those that constrain the entries that are used within sections (entry-level templates); and (4) those that constrain participations or act relationships used within other templates, not on their own. Templates are used to tailor the use of the HL7 CDA standard for exchange of particular types of information. A variety of terms are used to characterize the level of machine readability supported by a CDA document.

An unstructured CDA document may or may not assert conformance to a document-level template for the header content, but it has a non-xml body. The non-xml body is sometimes called an “unstructured” body, hence the term “unstructured document.”

Different levels of granularity can be used to characterize the machine readability of the contents of a CDA document. The definitions below are established in the CDA R2 standard:

**Table 1: Definition of CDA Levels from the HL7 CDA R2 standard.**

Level	Definition in CDA R2
CDA Level One	The unconstrained CDA specification.
CDA Level Two	The CDA specification with section-level templates applied.
CDA Level Three	The CDA specification with entry-level (and optionally section-level) templates applied.

A Level Two CDA includes constraints at the section-level of the document. A machine readable section code is used to represent the type of information in the section.

A Level Three CDA includes constraints at the entry-level of the document. Coded machine readable data is included to aid computer processing of the information contained in a document’s sections.

<sup>1</sup> D’Amore JD, et al. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2014;21:1060-1068. doi:10.1136/amiajnl-2014-002883. <https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article/21/6/1060/2909300>

### 3.2.1 Benefits of PACP unstructured CDA document exchange

Exchanging a PACP document as an unstructured document actually includes a great deal of structured information in the document's header, but not in the body, because an unstructured PACP document conforms to a specified PACP document header template.

Use of an unstructured PACP document offers a more attainable first step when taking a phased approach to adoption. The rich range of structured data available in the header makes it possible to associate the PACP document with the correct person. The header information also can be indexed for efficient searching and retrieval. The structured data in the header also can be re-used by document consuming applications to support other data processing functions.

**Figure 1: Unstructured PACP – Embedded**

```
<ClinicalDocument xmlns="urn:hl7-org:v3"
  xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
  xmlns:cda="urn:hl7-org:v3" xmlns:sdtc="urn:hl7-org:sdtc">

  <realmCode code="US"/>
  <typeId root="2.16.840.1.113883.1.3" extension="POCD_HD000040"/>
  <!-- PACP Header -->
  <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.2.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>
  <!-- PACP Document -->
  <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.1.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>

  . . .

  <code code="81334-5" displayName="Personal adv care plan"
    codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1" codeSystemName="LOINC"/>
  <title>Personal Advance Care Document</title>

  ...

  <!-- CDA nonXML Body -->
  <component>
    <nonXMLBody>
      <text mediaType="application/pdf" representation="B64">
JVBERi0xLjQNJeLjz9MNCjI2IDAgb2JqDTw8L0xpbmVhcml6ZWQgMS9MIDE0MzcxC9P
...
      ZWFtDWVuZG9iaGlzdGFydHhyZWYNMTE2DSU1RU9GDQ==
      </text>
    </nonXMLBody>
  </component>
</ClinicalDocument>
```

**Figure 2: Unstructured PACP – Referenced**

```
<ClinicalDocument xmlns="urn:hl7-org:v3"
  xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
  xmlns:cda="urn:hl7-org:v3" xmlns:sdtc="urn:hl7-org:sdtc">

  <realmCode code="US"/>
  <typeId root="2.16.840.1.113883.1.3" extension="POCD_HD000040"/>
  <!-- PACP Header -->
  <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.2.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>
```

```

<!-- PACP Document -->
<templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.1.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>
. . .

<code code="81334-5" displayName="Personal adv care plan"
      codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1" codeSystemName="LOINC"/>
<title>Personal Advance Care Plan Document</title>

...
<!-- CDA Body -->
<!--Example of referenced document-->
<component>
  <nonXMLBody>
    <text>
      <!-- This example assumes the pdf is in the same directory as the
CDA document. -->
      <!-- Assumptions about file location need to be addressed by
implementation. -->
      <reference value="Roger_McBee_2014-08-20.pdf"/>
    </text>
  </nonXMLBody>
</component>
</ClinicalDocument>

```

### 3.2.2 Benefits of PACP Level Two CDA document exchange

Due to the nature of the content expressed in a PACP document, machine processing of individual clinical statements may be less needed for effective sharing of this type of content. PACP documents primarily are intended to be read and understood by humans involved in the care planning process. The documents permit information to be shared that expresses the wide variety of personal thoughts and considerations that individuals may wish to share regarding the care experience in emergency, critical, and end-of-life medical situations when they can't speak for themselves.

While encoded header information will improve access and offer many helpful machine processable data elements, coded section content makes content in the documents more accessible and more understandable.

A Level Two CDA PACP document includes structured content within the body of the document. A framework of section-level coding creates a context that gives machine processable meaning to the various human readable component sections of the document. The machine readable section-level information indicates the type of information in each section, the author of the section, the subject, and other participant information that tells a computer about the information in each section. In essence, the body of a Level Two CDA document is communicated in meaningful, machine processable parts. The sections of the document are coded in ways that allows a computer to discern one part from another and the type of content contained in each part is standardized.

Exchanging a Level Two CDA PACP document offers all the same benefits associated with sharing a CDA unstructured document because it conforms to the same PACP document header template. Additionally, using the section code information, a machine can find the individual sections of a PACP document. A Level Two CDA PACP document can be parsed by a computer to quickly identify the section of the document that includes information about the person's healthcare agent assignments or the section

that includes his or her preferences upon death. Specific sections of the document can be rendered by the receiving application without requiring the human reader to scan through the whole document to find the needed information.

**Figure 3: Level Two CDA PACP Document**

```
<ClinicalDocument xmlns="urn:hl7-org:v3"
  xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
  xmlns:cda="urn:hl7-org:v3" xmlns:sdtc="urn:hl7-org:sdtc">

  <realmCode code="US"/>
  <typeId root="2.16.840.1.113883.1.3" extension="POCD_HD000040"/>
  <!-- PACP Header -->
  <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.2.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>
  <!-- PACP Document -->
  <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.1.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>
  . . .

  <code code="81334-5" displayName="Personal adv care plan"
    codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1" codeSystemName="LOINC"/>
  <title>Personal Advance Care Plan Document</title>
  . . .
  <component>
    <structuredBody>
      <!-- Advance Directives Section -->
      <component>
        <!-- nullFlavor of NI indicates No Information.-->
        <section>
          <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.3.1"
extension="2015-10-13"/>
          <!-- Advance Directives Section -->
          <code code="81334-5" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1"
codeSystemName="LOINC"/>
          <title>Personal Advance Care Plan</title>
          <text>
            <paragraph>It is very important for you to discuss your
medical treatment goals and wishes with your healthcare agent, your family, and
your medical care providers. Keep in mind that advance medical directives are
simply expressions of your medical treatment goals and preferences. There is no
guarantee that your medical care providers will follow all of your wishes, but
one thing is certain: If your advance medical directives cannot be quickly
located and retrieved in a time of need, then medical care providers, your
family and friends will not be able to take your wishes into consideration when
they make critical decisions regarding your treatment.</paragraph>
          </text>
          <!-- Opening text of the directive likely does not include
content that needs to be machine readable. -->

          . . .

          <component>
            <section>
              <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.3.5" extension="2015-
10-13"/>
              <code code="81337-8" displayName="GPP upon death"
codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1"
codeSystemName="LOINC"/></code>
              <title>Goals, preferences and priorities upon death</title>
              <text>
                <paragraph>
                  <caption styleCode="Bold">Consent to Donate</caption>
                  I consent to donate the following organs and tissues: Heart,
```

```

Kidneys, Eyes.
    </paragraph>
    <paragraph>
    <caption styleCode="Bold">Autopsy</caption>
    I want an autopsy if my doctor thinks it will help others.
    </paragraph>
    </text>
  </section>
</component>
. . .
  </section>
</component>
</section>
</component>
</structuredBody>
</component>
</ClinicalDocument>

```

### 3.2.3 Benefits of PACP Level Three CDA document exchange.

A Level Three CDA PACP document includes a structured header just as described for the unstructured and Level Two CDA PACP document. It includes structured sections within the body of the document, just as described for a Level Two CDA PACP document. Additionally, a Level Three CDA PACP document includes machine readable entries which encode some or all of the human readable information recorded in the document's sections.

Exchanging a Level Three CDA PACP document offers all the same benefits associated with sharing a CDA unstructured or Level Two CDA PACP. It conforms to the same PACP header template and uses the same section-level coding. Additionally, entry-level information (discrete data elements, not just high-level sections) of a Level Three CDA PACP document can be parsed by a computer. The human readable information in a section also is included as machine readable structured data. Inclusion of additional machine coded entries may offer less utility, at least initially, compared to the benefits of exchanging unstructured or Level Two CDA PACP documents. For more information on the benefits of exchanging unstructured CDA and Level Two CDA PACP documents. See section 3.2.1 and section 3.2.2, respectively for more information about the benefits of unstructured CDA and Level Two CDA PACP documents.

When exchanging a Level Three CDA PACP, not only can each section of the PACP be found and displayed rapidly, but in addition, information like the healthcare agent name and contact information or organ donation preference information could be processed by the application as machine readable data. This capability is not feasible when the PACP is a Level Two CDA and the information in the document is only available as human readable text.

It is important to note there are risks associated with automated processing of coded data. These risks exist for processing all types of coded data, but should be highlighted for the PACP use case due to the nature of the content. Coded data may not accurately include nuances present in the narrative text. A PACP document contains content expressing a patient's preferences for care, especially in critical care decision-making situations. For this reason, this IG takes the approach of coding the questions and not the answers. The questions are coded as discrete data to support faster retrieval of needed patient input. Answers however remain a narrative component of the digitally shared information. Care providers must read and interpret the patient preferences. This avoids inherent risks that could be introduced by automated processing. Human

interpretation is not removed from the automated processes made possible by sharing PACP documents.

**Figure 4: Level Three CDA PACP Document**

```
<ClinicalDocument xmlns="urn:hl7-org:v3"
  xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
  xmlns:cda="urn:hl7-org:v3" xmlns:sdtc="urn:hl7-org:sdtc">

  <realmCode code="US"/>
  <typeId root="2.16.840.1.113883.1.3" extension="POCD_HD000040"/>
  <!-- PACP Header -->
  <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.2.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>
  <!-- PACP Document -->
  <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.1.1" extension="2016-07-01"/>
  . . .

  <code code="81334-5" displayName="Personal adv care plan"
    codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1" codeSystemName="LOINC"/>
  <title>Personal Advance Care Plan Document</title>
  ...
  <component>
    <structuredBody>
      <!-- Advance Directives Section -->
      <component>
        <!-- nullFlavor of NI indicates No Information.-->
        <section>
          <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.3.1"
extension="2015-10-13"/>
          <!-- Personal Advance Directives section -->
          <code code="81334-5" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1"
displayName="Personal adv care plan"
codeSystemName="LOINC"/>
          <title>Personal Advance Care Plan</title>
          <text>
            <paragraph>It is very important for you to discuss your
medical treatment goals and wishes with your healthcare agent, your family, and
your medical care providers. Keep in mindthat advance medical directives are
simply expressions of your medical treatment goals and preferences. There is no
guarantee that your medical care providers will follow all of your wishes, but
one thing is certain: If your advance medical directives cannot bequickly
located and retrieved in a time of need, then medical care providers, your
family and friends will not be able to take your wishes into consideration when
they make critical decisions regarding your treatment.</paragraph>
          </text>
          <!-- Opening text of the directive likely does not include
content that needs to be machine readable. -->
          . . .

          <component>
            <section>
              <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.3.5" extension="2015-
10-13"/>
              <code code="81337-8" displayName="GPP upon death"
codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1"
codeSystemName="LOINC"/></code>
              <title>Goals, preferences and priorities upon death</title>
              <text>
                <paragraph>
                  <caption styleCode="Bold">Consent to Donate</caption>
                  I consent to donate the following organs and tissues: Heart,
Kidneys, Eyes.
                </paragraph>
                <paragraph>
```



```

        <caption styleCode="Bold">Autopsy</caption>
        I want an autopsy if my doctor thinks it will help others.
    </paragraph>
</text>
<entry>
    <observation classCode="OBS" moodCode="EVN">
        <templateId root="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.4.12"
extension="2016-07-01"/>
        <id root="77930ED8-3239-466A-9864-CDBEEADF6DF6"/>
        <code code="75781-5" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1"
            codeSystemName="LOINC" displayName="Thoughts on
organ and tissue donations">
            <originalText>
                <reference value="#GPP_ud_1_Q"></reference>
            </originalText>
        </code>
        <text>
            <reference value="#GPP_ud_1"></reference>
        </text>
        <statusCode code="completed"/>
        <value xsi:type="ED">
            <reference value="#GPP_ud_1_A"></reference>
        </value>
    </observation>
</entry>
. . .
</section>
</component>
. . .
</section>
</component>
</structuredBody>
</component>
</ClinicalDocument>

```

### 3.3 Required relationship between human readable information and machine readable information

The C-CDA recommends that clinical statements include a link between the narrative (section.text) and coded clinical data (entry). The HL7 C-CDA R2.1 Companion Guide R2 includes additional guidance saying, “Best practice for CDA creation is to represent all human readable text in the section, then reference the text from the discrete entries that represent the human readable information as machine processable data. To include narrative text linking, the text element of the primary (outermost) act in an entry should point, by reference, to the portion of the narrative text corresponding to the meaning of the entire clinical statement expressed in the discrete entry.”

The PACP IG raises the bar to enforce this best practice guidance as a requirement.

Rather than repeat these constraints in every applicable entry, the C-CDA Implementation Guide applies the following constraint to all entry-level templates, unless explicitly prohibited. In this guide, narrative text linking is raised from a SHOULD to a SHALL and the inclusion of linking for the originalText is raised from a MAY to a SHOULD. This is an additional requirement on PACP content creators which may carry additional development (hence cost) to ensure the linkages are included between the corresponding human readable and machine readable content. In this guide, the conformance constraints have been included in each entry template. The

CONF:XXXX is a placeholder for the conformance constraints uniquely numbered in each template.

- SHALL contain exactly one [1..1] text(CONF:XXXX).
- a. This text SHALL contain exactly one [1..1] reference (CONF: XXXX).
  - i. This reference **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] @value (CONF: XXXX)..
    - 1. This reference/@value SHALL begin with a '#' and SHALL point to its corresponding narrative (using the approach defined in CDA R2.0, section 4.3.5.1) (CONF: XXXX).

For the code element of all Acts and for the value element of observation Acts:

- This code **SHOULD** contain zero or one [0..1] originalText (CONF:XXXX).
- 1. The originalText, if present, **SHOULD** contain zero or one [0..1] reference (CONF:XXXX).
- 1. The reference, if present, **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] @value (CONF:XXXX).
- 1. This reference/@value SHALL begin with a '#' and SHALL point to its corresponding narrative (CONF:XXXX).

As defined in the base HL7 CDA R2.0 standard, an XML tag used to markup the narrative text in a CDA document can be used to wrap a string of text so that it can be explicitly referenced, or so that it can suggest rendering characteristics. The XML markup elements can nest recursively, which enables wrapping a string of plain text down to as small a chunk as desired.

For example, the <content> element contains an optional identifier that can serve as the target of a reference. All values of attributes of type XML ID must be unique within the document (per the W3C XML specification). The text element of a CDA clinical statement entry and the text element of an originalText component of a RIM attribute present in any CDA entry can make explicit reference to the identifier associated with the corresponding human readable information. This linking mechanism permits the relationship between the human readable narrative text and its associated CDA entry or one of its coded attributes to be represented explicitly.

The CDA R2 standard does not require CDA entries to reference into the CDA Narrative Block. However, it states, “the referencing mechanism can be used where it is important to represent the original text component of a coded CDA entry.”

To ensure the integrity of the information within a PACP document and as part of the approach taken in this IG to address the risks associated with processing discrete data (see section 3.2.3), the document **SHALL** include valid text linking between all machine processable clinical statements and the associated human readable information intended to convey the same meaning. This constraint has been added to ensure that applications processing the machine-readable content of the document receive information with the same semantic meaning as its corresponding human readable representation. The constraint also ensures that all clinically relevant content in

machine readable entries must also be represented in human readable form within the CDA narrative content. While this constraint does not eliminate the risk that the semantic meaning of coded data may not be identical to the meaning of the associated human readable information, it at least makes it possible to determine which human readable narrative is intended to hold the information that corresponds to the machine processable data.

Text linking for all machine-readable entries in a PACP document is required for several reasons:

- Text referencing is required to increase patient safety. Human verification of information that may be used in automated clinical decision support (CDS) applications is essential to prevent unintended data processing results. The “reference links” between human readable information and machine-readable information provide a mechanism that can be used to permit comparison to be made or facilitated as a human review to confirm if the narrative and machine encoded data provide information with the same semantic meaning.
- Text referencing provides a mechanism that can be used to permit comparison between the human readable information and the machine-readable information in a document. It can facilitate a human review to confirm that a CDA document does not include clinical content in machine readable form that is not also represented as human readable information. Performing comparison testing of this sort may require author participation or specialized clinical and/or technical knowledge. Text reference links also make it possible to confirm that an exchange document does not include additional machine encoded content that includes information other than what was consented to be shared.
- When the information being exchanged in a CDA document is highly sensitive to author attestation, such as attestation that the information in the document accurately reflects the author’s personal goals, preferences and priorities for care and treatment, text referencing ensures high integrity for the data. It reduces the risk that machine readable information does not carry the same semantic meaning as its corresponding human readable information.
- Text referencing also ensures that a CDA document does not include any additional clinical content in machine readable form which is not also represented as human readable information that the author can verify with a simple, standard mechanism. This mechanism uses the text linking references in the entry.text and originalText attributes of the machine-readable entries to compare the structured data in the document with the corresponding human readable information in the section.text elements of the document.

### **3.4 Information relationships with other C-CDA information exchange artifacts**

This section explains how information in a PACP document relates to and is compatible with information in the Advance Directives section defined in Consolidated CDA which can be used in Clinical Summary and Care Plan documents.

Figure 5 establishes a wireframe illustration format that makes it easier to construct diagrams representing these information relationships. It shows how this wireframe format can be used to create a diagram of the information relationships within a Care

Plan document that is equivalent to the Care Plan relationships diagram included in C-CDA. The left-hand side of the figure shows the illustration format used in C-CDA. The right-hand side shows the same set of relationships using the new wireframe format.

**Figure 5: Translation of Prior Care Plan Diagram**




Figure 6 shows that information in the Advance Directives section of a Clinical Summary can reference a PACP document as an external document (Arrow 1). Information in the Advance Directives section can identify the person acting as the patient's healthcare agent. This information could come from the PACP document (Arrow 2). Information in the Advance Directives section also can include observations made by the clinician about the type of advance care plan information that is available in the PACP document. The types of goals and preferences recorded in a PACP document could be determined based on the content in the PACP document (Arrow 3). (Note: the direction of the arrows shows newer information referencing previously created information. The Clinical Summary document contains information summarizing a care event that occurred after the PACP document information already existed. Thus, information in the Clinical Summary document references information in the PACP document.)

Figure 6 also shows that information in the PACP document may provide the rationale for procedures and tests performed (or not performed) during the encounter or episode of care documented in the Clinical Summary (Arrows 4 & 5). Information in the PACP document also may provide the rationale for the recommended plan of treatment (Arrow 6).

**Figure 6: Information Relationships: Clinical Summary to PACP document**





Figure 7 shows that a Care Plan document can include an Advance Directives section because the template is an “open template” which permits additional sections of information to be included in the document (additional section shown in red). By including an Advance Directives section, a Care Plan document can reference a PACP document as an external document (Arrow 7). Information in the Advance Directives section can identify the person acting as the patient’s healthcare agent. This information could come from the PACP document (Arrow 8). Information in the Advance Directives section also can include observations made by the clinician creating the Care Plan about the type of advance care plan information available in the person’s PACP document (Arrow 9).

Figure 7 also shows that information in the PACP document can inform the goals set by the clinician within the Care Plan (Arrow 10). Information in the PACP document also may provide the rationale for planned interventions (or interventions explicitly planned

not to be performed) as part of the patient's Care Plan (Arrow 11). (Note: As in Figure 6, the direction of the arrows shows newer information referencing previously created information. The Care Plan document contains care planning information that was created after the PACP document information already existed. Thus, information in the Care Plan document references information in the PACP document.)

It is important to note that medical intervention decisions, when made, are documented as orders in a person's medical record. Decisions made take priority when it comes to delivering care. Advance directives are simply input provided for consideration when making medical intervention decisions. Information in advance directives is not legally enforceable. Advance directives provide a safe harbor when treatment decisions are made based on the advance directives provided. Medical orders (decisions made) do not need to be consistent with the input from the directives, though they certainly may be.

**Figure 7: Information Relationship: Care Plan to PACP**




The interoperability of the information shared in these CDA information exchange artifacts is possible due to the section-level and entry-level template designs developed in the PACP document specification. Careful consideration went into designing section-level and entry-level template patterns that align with the section-level and entry-level templates defined in C-CDA. The structure and vocabulary of the entry-level templates

defined for the PACP document are intended to support this potential level of interoperability with Advance Directives Observation, Goal, Intervention, and other entry-level templates in Clinical Summary and Care Plan documents.

As advance care planning information becomes available digitally, additional consideration can be given to the processes used to verify the content expressed in standard PACP documents. Check-lists designed to guide clinicians in the review of patient-generated care planning information may reduce misunderstandings and minimize incorrect interpretation. Interactive forms used to record completion of verification steps could enhance patient safety and provide a record of the steps taken to review and incorporate patient goals, preferences, and priorities.

Figure 8 shows the combined view of the many relationships that can be established between patient-generated information in the PACP document and information recorded in EHRs by clinicians, then shared in Clinical Summary and Care Plan documents. It shows that information created by a person and shared in a standard digital CDA document can be re-used and referenced to make clinician documentation easier and more accurate. It can inform care delivery choices and care planning, making both more patient-centered, even when the patient's condition precludes participation in his or her care decisions.

**Figure 8: Information Relationships: Combined View**



### 3.4.1 Coded Content Crosswalk

Appendix E includes a content map which shows the crosswalk between: on one side the concepts used to encode personal goals, preferences, and priorities according to the PACP document standard, and on the other side coded concepts from the value set used within C-CDA R2.1 to summarize types of advance directives information recorded in a PACP document. The crosswalk enables a clinician to record what kind of advance care plan information is available in the person's referenced PACP document.

The crosswalk maps LOINC codes used in a PACP document to indicate the question a person is addressing in his or her advance care plan information to the corresponding SNOMED CT concepts used in an EHR to classify various types of advance directives content. For example, if a PACP document includes content encoded with the LOINC code 75787-2 (Thoughts on Intubation), then the clinician's system can use SNOMED CT code 52765003 (Intubation) to indicate that a person has documented intubation preferences.

Note that when an EHR records an Advance Directives Observation encoded with SNOMED CT code 52765003 (Intubation), the recorded observation does not indicate what the person's preferences were. It indicates the clinician observed that the person's advance care plan information includes preferences regarding intubation. In other words, the Advance Directives Observation in the Advance Directives section of a Clinical Summary document summarizes the types of goals, preferences and priorities in the referenced PACP document. Also, when a clinician records an observation to indicate that a type of advance care plan information exists, it is not equivalent to recording an order to perform or an order not to perform a certain procedure. The recording of an Advance Directives Observation only classifies the types of information available in the referenced PACP document. Within an EHR, classification of the types of available personal advance care plan information can speed clinician access to person-centered information in time-sensitive decision-making situations such as organ donation, resuscitation, or initiation of emergency department services.

## 3.5 Use of coded questions in machine readable entries

One coding strategy used in the design of machine readable entry-level templates in the PACP document utilizes standardized coded concepts to encode the questions addressed within the information rather than the answers. This approach has been taken to maximize the ability for each person to personalize his or her answers, but at the same time improve the ease with which certain types of information can be identified within the document. The Personal Health Goal template [observation: identifier urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.4.6:2016-07-01 (open)] and the Personal Intervention Preference template [observation: identifier urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.4.5:2016-07-01 (open)] demonstrate this technique.

At this point in time, different advance directive formats ask the same type of question in different ways. When the question intends to solicit the same type of information, the machine readable entry will carry a code to indicate the standard question being addressed. The originalText of that code will reference the question as it was posed in the source material, if one is explicitly included. Otherwise, there will be no additional originalText reference for the coded question. The answer to the question will be



encoded in the value element, and the originalText will reference the answer. See section 3.3 for guidance on the use of originalText with the code and value elements.

The nuance of classifying question content as the same or different is managed with the code system used to classify the types of questions. The LOINC ontology is designed around the “question and answer” paradigm and is well suited to support this approach.

In other cases, where content is specifically a goal statement or an explicit preference for a particular treatment (or not), clinical statement patterns established to represent goals and interventions in Consolidated CDA have been used.

Due to the nature of the content expressed in a PACP document, machine processing of individual clinical statements may be less needed for effective sharing of this type of content. PACP documents primarily are intended to be read and understood by humans involved in the care planning process. The documents permit information to be shared that expresses the wide variety of personal thoughts and considerations that individuals may wish to share regarding the care experience in emergency, critical, and end-of-life medical situations when they can’t speak for themselves.

While encoded header information will improve access and offer many helpful machine processable data elements, and coded section content will make content in the documents more accessible and more understandable, inclusion of additional machine coded entries may offer less utility, at least initially. For more information on the benefits of exchanging unstructured CDA and Level Two CDA PACP documents, see section 3.2.1 and section 3.2.2, respectively.

Volume 2 includes several clinical statement patterns that can be used to encode specific types of information expressed as a goal or treatment (intervention) preference. A specific clinical statement pattern for encoding ordered set of priorities has also been included. Other less specific types of clinical statement patterns have been defined to encode other types of directives and general statements that may be relevant to the care experience.

Implementers exchanging personal advance care planning information will need to determine the optimal type of clinical statement pattern to use when representing this information in a PACP document. The entry-level template choice will depend on the content being shared and the use case for the content.

As implementer experience with this specification increases, additional use cases may emerge that demonstrate a need for additional machine level encoding. The design strategy for this IG was to define a minimal set of clinical statement patterns with some more and some less specific meanings, then allow actual use of the standard to drive development of additional machine readable entry patterns.

## **3.6 Use of nested sections in a PACP document**

Advance care plan information exchanged in a PACP document may be consumed by a system and then included in a person’s clinical Care Plan. In order to preserve a context for the sections of advance care plan information, an outer section is used as a contextual container.

The Personal Advance Care Plan Section encompasses the following sub-sections of information:

**Table 2: PACP Sub-Section Design**

Sub-section Name	Description
Healthcare Agent Appointment	Information about and related to the appointment of a healthcare agent and up to two alternates.
GPP for End-of-Life or Severely Debilitating Condition	Advance care planning information relating to end-of-life or severely debilitating conditions.
GPP upon Death	Advance care planning information for after death has occurred.
GPP for Personal Care Experience	Information about other goals, preferences, or priorities relating to personal care experience.
Witness and Notary	Information about who has witnessed and notarized the advance care planning information, if available and appropriate.

When advance care plan information supplied by a person appears within the context of a larger clinician generated Care Plan, the section/sub-section design remains identical to the structure used in the body of the PACP document. This design reduces complexity and makes data processing consistent regardless of where the PACP document information is represented. For applications that view PACP document information, the outer section ensures the sub-sections of PACP document information are always rendered together. Without the contextual container, the subsections could become mixed in with other Care Plan document sections, making the information harder to understand and harder to find within a larger Care Plan document.

### 3.7 Overview of header data elements in the context of a PACP document

The header of a CDA document is a tightly specified set of information at the top of every CDA document. Header information can be used to search for and find the document in a repository or used to index the document into a registry. While the body of each type of CDA document may be very different, the rules of CDA R2 require the header of all CDA documents to be very similar. In simplistic terms, the elements of the CDA document header summarize the “who, what, when, and where” context for the health story contained in the document.

Nine specific “participations” and five “act relationships” have been defined for the CDA document header. Three of the participations are required. Some of the header elements are repeatable. Each type of CDA document must define which of the other participations and act relationships to include (in addition to those that are required) and provide implementer guidance regarding what information to populate in the header elements.

In the context of a PACP document, the CDA header elements record the information described in the table below. (See Volume 2 for additional PACP header template constraints.) The table below summarizes the new guidance specific to PACP document

and which further constrains the C-CDA US Realm Header for Patient Generated Document Header, which in turn is a further constraint on the C-CDA US Realm Header.

**Table 3: PACP Header Element Constraints**

Header Participations:	
recordTarget (the subject of the document)	<p>The PACP document header SHALL include 1 recordTarget.</p> <p>The recordTarget SHALL record information about the person whose advance care plan information is recorded in the document.</p> <p>If the subject of the document has a legal guardian, the recordTarget/patientRole/patient/guardian SHALL record information about the guardian.</p> <p>Multiple guardians MAY be included to support situations when the subject of the document has more than one legal guardian</p>
author	<p>The PACP document header SHALL include only 1author person.</p> <p>The author SHALL be the same person as the recordTarget.</p> <p>Note: In the case where the recordTarget is not able to "write" the PACP contents due to literacy constraints or physical disability, e.g. hemiplegia, the recordTarget/subject is still considered author of the content, and a data enterer will fill the role of physically creating the document by entering the author's requested information into the system used to assemble the document.</p>
custodian	<p>The PACP document header SHALL include 1 custodian.</p> <p>The custodian SHALL record the organization which maintains the "original copy" of the document created to record the person's advance care plan information.</p> <p>If the custodian of the document is an individual, he or she SHALL be recorded as the custodian organization due to current limitations of CDA R2.</p>
participant	<p>The PACP document does not further constrain the cardinality or use of the participant participation. It can be used to document other individuals with a personal, legal, or care relationship to the patient.</p> <p>A participant with typeCode of "DEV" and a functionCode of "assembler" MAY be used to represent the organization responsible for assembling the information into the document. Currently CDA R2.0 does not provide a way to record the name of the system used to do the digital "assembling" process.</p>
authenticator	<p>The PACP document MAY include zero or more authenticators.</p> <p>Each authenticator SHALL represent someone who signs the information including the person authoring the document or any</p>

	witness(es) who attest(s) to the identity of the author who created the document.
legalAuthenticator	The PACP document MAY include zero or one legalAuthenticator. The legalAuthenticator SHALL represent the person who notarized the information. This person is attesting to the identity of the author who created the document.
informant	The informant participation SHALL NOT be included in a PACP document header because all goals, preferences, and priorities are intended to be the personal thoughts of the author.
<b>Header Act Relationships:</b>	
authorization/consent	No further constraints on CDA R2.
componentOf/encapsulatingEncounter	No further constraints on CDA R2.
documentationOf/serviceEvent	No further constraints on CDA R2.
infulfillmentOf/order	No further constraints on CDA R2.

The PACP header may include zero or one relatedDocument element. A relatedDocument element is only included in the PACP header when the PACP document is intended to replace a prior document. Otherwise this act relationship is not included. Only the typeCode of RPLC SHALL be used in the relatedDocument element. This indicates that the current document replaces the referenced parent document. Other typeCodes are not permitted.

These established specifications are defined in greater detail within the PACP document header template in Volume 2.

### 3.8 Assertion of template conformance for instance validation and interoperability

Within the definition of a template, there are two ways to assert conformance with the definition of another template.

One option is to assert a design relationship to another template. There are several possible design relationships defined in the HL7 Templates Standard: Specification and Use of Reusable Information Constraint Templates, Release 1 ([http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product\\_brief.cfm?product\\_id=377](http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=377)). One commonly used design relationship is “conforms to.” An assertion that Template A conforms to Template B means that Template A adopts by reference all of the conformance statements contained in Template B. This one design relationship assertion in the definition of Template A implies, by reference, every conformance statement contained in Template B without having to reassert these conformances in the definition of Template A. Validators and other applications consuming information

that conforms to Template A, also must validate an interoperate on the information according to the conformance requirements of Template B. Use of the "conforms to" design relationship is a good way to maintain consistency throughout a set of similar templates. It also reduces the number of conformance statements that need to be independently managed. However, it does create dependency between templates that needs to be considered when designing templates.

The following example shows the conformance statements in the PACP document header template that express the dependency between the PACP document header template and the C-CDA document header template. The first conformance statement asserts that the PACP header template conforms to the US Realm Header (V3) template used in C-CDA. That means the PACP header adopts all the conformance statements asserted by the US Realm Header (V3) template. The second conformance statement requires each instance of a PACP document to include an assertion of conformance to the PACP header template, which in turn conforms to all the conformance statements defined for the US Realm Header (V3) template. Thus, these two conformance statements ensure the interoperability of PACP documents for all systems that support and process C-CDA documents.

1. **CONFORMS TO** US Realm Header (V3) template (identifier: urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.1.1:2015-08-01).
2. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **templateId** (CONF:2211-28458) such that it
  - a. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@root**="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.2.1" (CONF:2211-28459).
  - b. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@extension**="2015-10-13" (CONF:2211-32917).

The other option is to assert conformance to another template directly. One template can include a conformance statement that requires, recommends, or permits assertion of another template. Template A can require assertion of Template B. The design choice to assert Template B when asserting Template A directly signals validators and other applications consuming information conforming to Template A that the information also conforms to Template B. The conformance assertions in Template B are not implied by reference. The onus is on the designer of Template A to ensure that the assertion of conformance to Template B is true. This strategy is used when dependency between template definitions is not desired, but the conformance relationship of the information to multiple templates is beneficial for interoperability and validation. This type of template conformance assertion tells an application that can process information conforming to the US Realm Header (V3) template that it can safely use the same processing capabilities on information conforming to the PACP document Header.

PACP document Header

1. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **templateId** (CONF:2211-28458) such that it
  - a. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@root**="2.16.840.1.113883.4.823.1.2.1" (CONF:2211-28459).

- b. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@extension**="2015-10-13" (CONF:2211-32917).

US Realm Header (V3) from C-CDA R2.1

- 2. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **templateId** (CONF:2211-33160) such that it
  - a. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@root**="2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.1.1" (CONF:2211-33161).
  - b. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@extension**="2015-08-01" (CONF:2211-33162).

## 4 USING THIS IG

This chapter describes the rules and formalisms used to constrain the CDA R2 standard. It describes the formal representation of CDA versioned templates, the mechanism by which templates are bound to vocabulary, and additional information necessary to understand and correctly implement the content found in Volume 2 of this IG.

### 4.1 Conformance Conventions Used in This Guide

Conformance statements within this IG are presented as constraints from Trifolia Workbench, a template repository. Functionality within the Trifolia Workbench may influence the conventions used in this IG.

#### 4.1.1 Templates and Conformance Statements

When defining CDA templates using Trifolia Workbench, an algorithm converts constraints recorded in Trifolia to a printable presentation. Each constraint is uniquely identified by an identifier at or near the end of the constraint (e.g., CONF:86-7345). The digits in the conformance number before the hyphen identify which IG the template belongs to and the number after the hyphen is unique to the owning IG. Together, these two numbers uniquely identify each constraint. These identifiers are persistent but not sequential. Conformance numbers in this guide associated with a conformance statement that is carried forward from a previous version of this guide will carry the same conformance number from the previous version. This is true even if the previous conformance statement has been edited. If a conformance statement is entirely new it will have a new conformance number.

Bracketed information following each template title indicates the template type (section, observation, act, procedure, etc.), currently a uniform resource name (URN) and previously an object identifier (OID), and whether the template is open or closed. As of May 2014, templates are identified by a URN that includes version information (e.g., urn:hl7ii). The URN identifier includes both the @root and @extension value for the templateId (for example, this uniform resource urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.5.5.41:2014-06-09 has an @root of 2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.5.5.41 and an @extension of 2014-06-09). The @extension value is a date identifying the version of the template. Templates defined prior to May 2014 were not versioned and include only the @root value. These earlier templates are identified using an object identifier (OID) and include an @root value and no @extension value.

Each section and entry template in Volume 2 of this IG includes a context table. The "Contained By" column indicates which templates use the template being defined, and if the template is optional or required in the containing template. The "Contains" column indicates any templates that the template uses.

**Table 4: Contexts Table Example—Allergy Concern Act (V2)**

Contained By:	Contains:
<a href="#">Allergies and Intolerances Section (entries optional) (V2)</a> (optional)	<a href="#">Allergy - Intolerance Observation (V2)</a>
<a href="#">Allergies and Intolerances Section (entries required) (V2)</a> (required)	<a href="#">Author Participation</a>

Each entry template also includes a constraints overview table to summarize the constraints in the template.

**Table 5: Constraints Overview Example—Allergy Concern Act (V2)**

XPath	Card.	Verb	Data Type	CONF#	Value
act (identifier: urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.30:2014-06-09)					
ode @classC	1..1	SHALL		<a href="#">1098-7469</a>	2.16.840.1.113883.5.6 (HL7ActClass) = ACT
ode @moodC	1..1	SHALL		<a href="#">1098-7470</a>	2.16.840.1.113883.5.1001 (ActMood) = EVN
d templatel	1..1	SHALL		<a href="#">1098-7471</a>	
@root	1..1	SHALL		<a href="#">1098-10489</a>	2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.3 0
on @extensi	1..1	SHALL		<a href="#">1098-32543</a>	2014-06-09
...					

The expression “such that it” at the end of one conformance statement links that conformance statement to the following subordinate conformance statement to further constrain the first conformance statement. To understand the full effect of this conformance construct, the two conformances must be considered as a single compound requirement. The subordinate conformance statement functions as a subordinate clause (like a “where” clause), which is being applied on the first conformance statement.

The following example shows a compound conformance statement made up of two conformance statements joined by a “such that it” clause. The effect of this syntax can be interpreted as a “where” clause. Thus...

3. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **templateId** (CONF:81-7899) such that it
  - a. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1]
   
@root="2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.31" (CONF:81-10487).

...is understood as:


This template **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **templateId** where it contains exactly one [1..1] @root="2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.31".

This means that you must have a template id with @root="2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.31", but you can also have other template ids with different valued attributes.



The following figure shows a typical template's set of constraints presented in this guide. The following chapters describe specific aspects of conformance statements—open vs. closed templates, conformance verbs, cardinality, vocabulary conformance, containment relationships, and null flavors.

**Figure 9: Constraint Conformance Including "such that it" Syntax Example**



## 4.1.2 Template Versioning

A new version of an existing IG reuses templates from the previous version. During the ballot phase or update phase, templates carry the designation “Published” to indicate the template is unchanged from the previous version or “Draft” to indicate a new or revised template. Substantial revisions to previously published templates are indicated by the version number (V2, V3, etc.) in all phases: ballot, update, and published guides.

If there are no substantive changes to a template that has been successfully published, the template will carry the same templateId/@root (identifier oid) and templateId/@extension as in the previous IG. (In the case of older templates, the @extension attribute will not be present.) During a new ballot or update phase, “Published” is appended to the main heading for the template to indicate that the template cannot be commented on in the ballot or update. The “Published” designation is removed in the final publication versions.

A revised version of a previously published template keeps the same templateId/@root as the previous version but is assigned a new templateId/@extension. The notation “(Vn)” (V2, V3, etc.) is also added to the template name. Versions are not necessarily forward or backward compatible. A versioning may be due to substantive changes in the template or because a contained template has changed. The “(Vn)” designation is persistent; it appears with that template when it is used in subsequent guides. During a new ballot or update phase, “Draft” is appended to the main heading for the template to indicate that it may be voted on in the ballot or commented on in the update; the “Draft” designation is removed in the final publication versions.

A new version of a template is explicitly linked to the prior version, enabling the automatic generation of the detailed change log found in Volume 2, Chapter 9 “Changes From Previous Version”.

As an example, the change log for a versioned template is shown in the following figure. In this example, Medication Activity (2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.16) has versioned to Medication Activity (V2) (2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.16:2014-06-09).

**Table 6: Change Log for Versioned Templates**

Change	Old	New
Name	Medication Activity	Medication Activity (V2)
OID	urn:oid:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.16	urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.16:2014-06-09
Description	A medication activity describes ...	A medication activity describes ...
CONF #: 1098-30822 Added		SHALL contain exactly one [1..1] Drug Monitoring Act (NEW) (identifier: urn:oid:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.123) (CONF:1098-30822).
...		
CONF #: 81-7511 Removed	SHALL contain exactly one [1..1] low (CONF:81-7511).	
...		
CONF #: 1098-7516 Modified	SHOULD contain zero or one [0..1] doseQuantity	SHALL contain exactly one [1..1] doseQuantity
...		

Structured Documents Work Group (SDWG) collaborated with Templates Work Group to establish template versioning recommendations, published in the following specification: [HL7 Templates Standard: Specification and Use of Reusable Information Constraint Templates, Release 1](#). SDWG leverages that specification to create guidance for template IDs and template versioning.

### 4.1.3 Open and Closed Templates

In open templates, all of the features of the CDA R2 base specification are allowed except as constrained by the templates. By contrast, a closed template specifies everything that is allowed, and nothing further may be included.

Estimated Date of Delivery (templateId 2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.15.3.1) is an example of a closed template in this Implementation Guide.

Open templates allow HL7 implementers to develop additional structured content not constrained within this Implementation Guide. HL7 encourages implementers to bring their use cases forward as candidate requirements to be formalized in a subsequent version of the standard to maximize the use of shared semantics.

#### 4.1.4 Conformance Verbs (Keywords)

The keywords **SHALL**, **SHOULD**, **MAY**, **NEED NOT**, **SHOULD NOT**, and **SHALL NOT** in this document are to be interpreted as described in the HL7 Version 3 Publishing Facilitator's Guide.<sup>2</sup>

- **SHALL**: an absolute requirement.
- **SHALL NOT**: an absolute prohibition against inclusion (Note: SHALL NOT on an element prohibits the inclusion of that element, which means including the null flavor attribute on the element would not be possible. Thus, MSK would not be allowed.)
- **SHOULD/SHOULD NOT**: best practice or recommendation. There may be valid reasons to ignore an item, but the full implications must be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.
- **MAY/NEED NOT**: truly optional; can be included or omitted as the author decides with no implications.

The keyword "**SHALL**" allows the use of `nullFlavor` unless the requirement is on an attribute or the use of `nullFlavor` is explicitly precluded.

When conformance statements are nested (or have subordinate clauses) the conformance statements are to be read and interpreted in hierarchical order. These hierarchical clauses can be interpreted as "if then, else" clauses. Thus...

- a. This `structuredBody` **SHOULD** contain zero or one [0..1] **component** (CONF:1098-29066) such that it
  - i. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] Plan of Treatment Section (V2) (identifier: urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.2.10:2014-06-09) (CONF:1098-29067).

...is understood as:

- a. It is recommended (**SHOULD**) that the `structureBody` contains a component.
  - i. **If** the component exists, **then** it must contain a Plan of Treatment Section (V2),
  - ii. **else** the component does not exist, and the conformance statement about the Plan of Treatment Section (V2) should be skipped.

In the case where the higher level conformance statement is a **SHALL**, there is no conditional clause. Thus...

- b. This `structuredBody` **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **component** (CONF:1098-29086) such that it
  - i. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] Problem Section (entries required) (V2) (identifier: urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.2.5.1:2014-06-09) (CONF:1098-29087).

...means that the `structuredBody` is always required to have a component.

---

<sup>2</sup> HL7, Version 3 Publishing Facilitator's Guide. <http://www.hl7.org/v3ballot/html/help/pfg/pfg.htm>

### 4.1.5 Cardinality

The cardinality indicator (0..1, 1..1, 1..\*, etc.) specifies the allowable occurrences within a document instance. The cardinality indicators are interpreted with the following format “m...n” where m represents the least and n the most:

- 0..1 zero or one
- 1..1 exactly one
- 1..\* at least one
- 0..\* zero or more
- 1..n at least one and not more than n
- 0..0 no occurrences are permitted

When a constraint has subordinate clauses, the scope of the cardinality of the parent constraint must be clear. In the next figure, the constraint says exactly one participant is to be present. The subordinate constraint specifies some additional characteristics of that participant.

**Figure 10: Constraints Format – only one allowed**

1. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **participant** (CONF:2777).
    - a. This participant **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@typeCode="LOC"** (CodeSystem: 2.16.840.1.113883.5.90 HL7ParticipationType) (CONF:2230).

In the next figure, the constraint says only one participant “like this” is to be present. Other participant elements are not precluded by this constraint.

**Figure 11: Constraints Format – only one like this allowed**

1. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **participant** (CONF:2777) such that it
    - a. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@typeCode="LOC"** (CodeSystem: 2.16.840.1.113883.5.90 HL7ParticipationType) (CONF:2230).

In the next figure, the constraint prohibits an assignedAuthor element from being included. The phrase “shall not contain” implies a cardinality of [0..0] for the element.

**Figure 12: Constraints Format – none like this allowed**

- ii. This assignedAuthor **SHALL NOT** contain [0..0] **assignedAuthoringDevice** (CONF:2211-33108).

### 4.1.6 Optional and Required with Cardinality

The terms *optional* and *required* describe the *lower* bound of cardinality as follows:

*Optional* means that the number of allowable occurrences of an element may be 0; the cardinality will be expressed as [0..1] or [0..\*] or similar. In these cases, the element may not be present in the instance. Conformances formulated with **MAY** or **SHOULD** are both considered "optional" conformances.

*Required* means that the number of allowable occurrences of an element must be at least 1; the cardinality will be expressed as [m..n], where m >=1 and n >=1 (for example, [1..1] or [1..\*]). In these cases, the element must be present in the instance. Conformance statements formulated with **SHALL** are required conformances. If an element is required but it is not known, the @nullFlavor attribute must be used. See [Unknown and No Known Information](#).

#### 4.1.7 Containment Relationships

Containment constraints between a section and its entries allow indirect containment in this guide. This means that where a section asserts containment of an entry, that entry either can be a direct child or a further descendent of that section.

For example, in the following constraint:

1. **SHALL** contain at least one [1..\*] **entry** (CONF:8647) such that it
  - a. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] [Advance Directive Observation](#) (templateId:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.48) (CONF:8801).

The Advance Directive Observation can be a direct child of the section (i.e., section/entry/AdvanceDirectiveObservation) or a further descendent of that section (i.e., section/entry/.../AdvanceDirectiveObservation). Either of these are conformant.

All other constraints are direct and do not allow an indirect containment relationship, for example:

1. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] templateId/@root="2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.2.21" (CONF:7928).

The templateId must be a direct child of the section (i.e., section/templateId).

#### 4.1.8 Vocabulary Conformance

The templates in this document use terms from several code systems. These vocabularies are defined in various supporting specifications and may be maintained by other bodies, as is the case for the LOINC® and SNOMED CT® vocabularies.

Note that value set identifiers (e.g., ValueSet 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.78 Observation Interpretation (HL7) **DYNAMIC**) used in the binding definitions of template conformance statements do not appear in the XML instance of a CDA document. The definition of the template must be referenced to determine or validate the vocabulary conformance requirements of the template.

Value set bindings adhere to HL7 Vocabulary Working Group best practices and include both an indication of stability and of coding strength for the binding. Value set bindings can be **STATIC**, meaning that they bind to a specified version of a value set, or **DYNAMIC**, meaning that they bind to the most current version of the value set. If a **STATIC** binding is specified, a date **SHALL** be included to indicate the value set version. If a **DYNAMIC** binding is specified, the value set authority and link to the base definition of the value set **SHALL** be included, if available, so implementers can access the current version of the value set. When a vocabulary binding binds to a single code, the stability of the binding is implicitly **STATIC**.

**Figure 13: Binding to a Single Code**

2. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **code** (CONF:15403).
- a) This code **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@code**="11450-4" Problem List (CONF:15408).
  - b) This code **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **@codeSystem**="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1" (CodeSystem: LOINC 2.16.840.1.113883.6.1 **STATIC**) (CONF: 31141).

The notation conveys the actual code (11450-4), the code's `displayName` (Problem List), the OID of the `codeSystem` from which the code is drawn (2.16.840.1.113883.6.1), and the `codeSystemName` (LOINC).

HL7 Data Types Release 1 requires the `codeSystem` attribute unless the underlying data type is "Coded Simple" or "CS," in which case it is prohibited. The `displayName` and the `codeSystemName` are optional, but recommended, in all cases.

The above example would be properly expressed as follows.

**Figure 14: XML Expression of a Single-Code Binding**

```
<code code="11450-4" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1"/>

<!-- or -->

<code code="11450-4" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1"
      displayName="Problem List"
      codeSystemName="LOINC"/>
```

A full discussion of the representation of vocabulary is outside the scope of this implementation guide. For more information, see the *HL7 V3 Normative Edition 2010*<sup>3</sup> sections on Abstract Data Types and XML Data Types R1.

There is a discrepancy between the HL7 R1 Data Types and this Implementation Guide in the use of translation code versus the original code. The R1 data type requires the original code in the root. The convention agreed upon for this IG specifies that a code from the required value set be used in the element, and other codes not included in the value set are to be represented in a translation for the element. This discrepancy is resolved in HL7 Data Types R2.

In the next example, the conformant code is SNOMED CT code 206525008.

**Figure 15: Translation Code Example**

```
<code code='206525008'
      displayName='neonatal necrotizing enterocolitis'
      codeSystem='2.16.840.1.113883.6.96'
      codeSystemName='SNOMED CT'>
  <translation code='NEC-1'
    displayName='necrotizing enterocolitis'
    codeSystem='2.16.840.1.113883.19'/>
</code>
```

Value set tables are present below a template, or are referenced if they occur elsewhere in the specification, when there are value set bindings in the template. The value set table provides the value set identifier, a description, and a link to the source of the

<sup>3</sup> HL7 Version 3 Interoperability Standards, <http://www.hl7.org/memonly/downloads/v3edition.cfm - V32010>

value set when possible. Ellipses in the last row indicate the value set members shown are examples and the true source must be accessed to see all members.

If a value set binding has a **DYNAMIC** stability, implementers creating a CDA document must go to the location in the URL to check for the most current version of the value set expansion.

**Table 7: Example Value Set Table (Referral Types)**

Value Set: Referral Types 2.16.840.1.113883.11.20.9.56 A value set of SNOMED-CT codes descending from "3457005" patient referral (procedure). Value Set Source: <a href="http://vtsl.vetmed.vt.edu/TerminologyMgt/RF2Browser/ISA.cfm?SCT_ConceptID=3457005">http://vtsl.vetmed.vt.edu/TerminologyMgt/RF2Browser/ISA.cfm?SCT_ConceptID=3457005</a>			
Code	Code System	Code System OID	Print Name
44383000	SNOMED CT	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	Patient referral for consultation
391034007	SNOMED CT	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	Refer for falls assessment (procedure)
86395003	SNOMED CT	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	Patient referral for family planning (procedure)
306106002	SNOMED CT	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	Referral to intensive care service (procedure)
306140002	SNOMED CT	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	Referral to clinical oncology service (procedure)
396150002	SNOMED CT	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	Referral for substance abuse (procedure)
...			

#### 4.1.9 Data Types

All data types used in a CDA document are described in the CDA R2 normative edition.<sup>4</sup> All attributes of a data type are allowed unless explicitly prohibited by this specification.

#### 4.1.10 Document-Level Templates "Properties" Heading

In Volume 2 of this IG, each document-level template has a "Properties" heading for ease of navigation. The Properties heading is an organizational construct, underneath which relevant CDA act-relationships and roles are called out as headings in the document.

## 4.2 XML Conventions Used in This Guide

#### 4.2.1 XPath Notation

Instead of the traditional dotted notation used by HL7 to represent RIM classes, this document uses XML Path Language (XPath) notation<sup>5</sup> in conformance statements and elsewhere to identify the XML elements and attributes within the CDA document instance to which various constraints are applied. The implicit context of these

<sup>4</sup> HL7 CDA Release 2. [http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product\\_brief.cfm?product\\_id=7](http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=7)

<sup>5</sup> W3C, XML Path Language. <http://www.w3.org/TR/xpath/>

expressions is the root of the document. This notation provides a mechanism that will be familiar to developers for identifying parts of an XML document.

XPath statements appear in this document in a monospace font.

XPath syntax selects nodes from an XML document using a path containing the context of the node(s). The path is constructed from node names and attribute names (prefixed by a '@') and catenated with a '/' symbol.

**Figure 16: XML Document Example**

```
<author>
  <assignedAuthor>
    ...
    <code codeSystem='2.16.840.1.113883.6.96' codeSystemName='SNOMED CT'
      code='17561000' displayName='Cardiologist' />
    ...
  </assignedAuthor>
</author>
```

In the above example, the `code` attribute of the `code` could be selected with the XPath expression in the next figure.

**Figure 17: XPath Expression Example**

```
author/assignedAuthor/code/@code
```

#### 4.2.2 XML Examples and Sample Documents

Extensible Mark-up Language (XML) examples appear in figures in this document in this monospace font. XML elements (`code`, `assignedAuthor`, etc.) and attribute names (SNOMED CT, 17561000, etc.) also appear in this monospace font. Portions of the XML content may be omitted from the content for brevity, marked by an ellipsis (...) as shown in the example below.



## 5 REFERENCES

- 5 Wishes Advance Directive Document.  
<http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:5wishes.pdf>
- American Recovery And Reinvestment Act of 2009, US Public Law 111-5, 123 Stat. 115, 516 (Feb. 19, 2009). <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-111publ5/content-detail.html>
- A 2-Pronged Approach to Advance Directives. American College of Physicians.  
<http://www.acpinternist.org/archives/2015/09/advanced-directive.htm>
- A Better End of Life. D Kendall and E. Quill. Third Way Report (published online September 29, 2015). <http://www.thirdway.org/report/a-better-end-of-life>
- About Advance Directives. MedlinePlus articles.  
<https://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/advancedirectives.html>
- Advance Directives and Advance Care Planning: Report to Congress, prepared under contract #HHS-100-03-0023 between the U.S. Department of Health and the RAND Corporation (August 2008). <http://aspe.hhs.gov/basic-report/advance-directives-and-advance-care-planning-report-congress>
- Advance Directives for Health Care, Oklahoma Bar Association.  
<http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:OklahomaAdvDirective2006.pdf>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: FastStats – Emergency Department Visits, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/emergency-department.htm>
- Conversation Starters for Doctors, Family and Your Healthcare Agent. MyDirectives.com. <https://mydirectives.com/en/help/conversation-starters/>
- Creating an Advance Care Plan. Prepare For Your Care.  
[www.prepareforyourcare.org](http://www.prepareforyourcare.org)
- Final Chapter: Californian’s Attitudes and Experiences with Death and Dying. California HealthCare Foundation (February 2012).  
<http://www.chcf.org/publications/2012/02/final-chapter-death-dying>
- *Final Rule* (Stage 3 Meaningful Use), (October 16th, 2015).  
<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/10/16/2015-25595/medicare-and-medicaid-programs-electronic-health-record-incentive-program-stage-3-and-modifications>
- Giving Someone a Power of Attorney For Your Health Care: A Guide with an Easy-to-Use, Legal Form for All Adults. The Commission on Law and Aging, American Bar Association.  
[http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:2011\\_ABA\\_Model\\_Directive.pdf](http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:2011_ABA_Model_Directive.pdf)
- HL7 Care Plan webpage.  
<https://confluence.hl7.org/display/PC/Care+Plan+Projects>*HL7 Clinical Document Architecture, Release 2 (CDA R2)*. (May 2005).  
[http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product\\_brief.cfm?product\\_id=7](http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=7)
- *HL7 Version 3 Publishing Facilitator's Guide*, Release 1. (2005).  
<http://www.hl7.org/v3ballot/html/help/pfg/pfg.htm>

- Kaiser Health Tracking Poll: September 2015. The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation (September 30, 2015). <http://kff.org/health-costs/poll-finding/kaiser-health-tracking-poll-september-2015/>
- Power of Attorney for Healthcare Document. The La Crosse Region. [http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:12860\\_POAHC.lse.12.08.pdf](http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:12860_POAHC.lse.12.08.pdf)
- S&I Framework, electronic Long-Term Support Services (eLTSS) [http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product\\_brief.cfm?product\\_id=495](http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=495)
- S&I Framework, LCC Long-Term Post-Acute Care (LTPAC) Transition SWG [http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product\\_brief.cfm?product\\_id=291](http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=291)
- SMART Platforms website. <http://smartplatforms.org>
- Stages and Tools for Goals of Care Conversations. Catholic Church Supportive Care Coalition. <https://supportivecarecoalition.org/resources>
- Starter-Kit. The Conversation Project. [http://theconversationproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/TCP\\_StarterKit\\_Final.pdf](http://theconversationproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/TCP_StarterKit_Final.pdf)
- Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary, 21st Edition, F.A. Davis Company. <http://www.tabers.com>
- The Good-to-Go Tool Kit. Compassion and Choices. [www.compassionandchoices.org](http://www.compassionandchoices.org)
- Trifolia Workbench (Consolidation Project Edition). Open source template database. <https://trifolia.lantanagroup.com/>
- Using Advance Directives. Assorted articles. <http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/835645>  
<http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/842419>  
<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=S6XKv7MOuts>  
<http://www.healthitoutcomes.com/doc/the-pros-and-cons-of-emr-in-end-of-life-care-0001>  
<http://www.medpagetoday.com/HospitalBasedMedicine/Hospitalists/53673>
- VA Advance Directive Durable Power of Attorney for Health Care and Living Will. Department of Veterans Affairs. [http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:Veterans\\_Administration\\_Form\\_Advance\\_Directive\\_%28July\\_2012%29.pdf](http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:Veterans_Administration_Form_Advance_Directive_%28July_2012%29.pdf)

## Appendix A: Format Codes

The PACP IG declares the following format codes to be used in the metadata to indicate the technical format for the document. HL7 has defined a pattern for establishing format codes for documents that meet a published technical specification. Thus, the IG should explicitly make this information available for implementers. The format codes for the PACP documents are:

urn:hl7-org:sdwg:pacp-structuredBody:1.0 For documents following PACP 1.0

constraints using a structured body.

urn:hl7-org:sdwg:pack-nonXMLBody:1.0 For documents following PACP 1.0 constraints using a structured body.

## **Appendix B: Extensions to CDA R2**

Where there is a need to communicate information for which there is no suitable representation in CDA R2, extensions to CDA R2 have been developed. This appendix serves to summarize extensions that potentially are relevant to the PACP document. Additional implementation guidance is available on the Structured Documents Confluence page <https://confluence.hl7.org/display/SD/CDA+Extensions>

Extensions are also described in the context of the templates where they are used in Volume 2.

Extensions potentially relevant to this IG include:

- `sdhc:raceCode` - The `raceCode` extension allows for multiple races to be reported for a patient.
- `sdhc:ethnicGroupCode` - The `ethnicGroupCode` extension allows for multiple ethnicities to be reported for a patient.
- `sdhc:id` - The `id` extension on the related subject allows for unique identification of the subject.
- `sdhc:deceasedInd` - The `deceasedInd` extension (true or false) for the patient or related subject is used to indicate if the subject is deceased.
- `sdhc:deceasedTime` - The `deceasedTime` extension for the patient or related subject is used to indicate when the subject has died.
- `sdhc:birthTime` - The `sdhc:birthTime` element allows for the birth date of any person to be recorded. The purpose of this extension is to allow the recording of the subscriber or member of a health plan in cases where the health plan eligibility system has different information on file than the provider does for the patient.
- `sdhc:signatureText` - The `sdhc:signatureText` element provides a location in CDA for a textual or multimedia depiction of the signature by which the participant endorses and accepts responsibility for his or her participation in the Act as specified in the `Participation.typeCode`. Details of what goes in the field are described in the HL7 IG for CDA® Release 2: Digital Signatures and Delegation of Rights, Release 1.
- `sdhc:priorityNumber` - The `sdhc:priorityNumber` element provides an integer priority number within the set of components in an organizer.

Implementers of this implementation guide follow guidance on creating and managing CDA extensions established by HL7 SDWG.

## Appendix C: Coded Content Crosswalk

This appendix includes a content map which shows the crosswalk between: on one side the concepts used to encode personal goals, preferences, and priorities according to the PACP document standard and on the other side coded concepts from the value set used within C-CDA R2.1 to summarize types of advance directives information recorded in a PACP document. The crosswalk enables a clinician to record what kind of advance care plan information is available in the person's referenced PACP document.

The crosswalk maps LOINC codes used in a PACP document to indicate the question a person is addressing in his or her advance care plan information to the corresponding SNOMED CT concepts used in an EHR to classify various types of advance directives content. For example, if a PACP document includes content encoded with the LOINC code 75787-2 (Thoughts on Intubation), then the clinician's system can use SNOMED CT code 52765003 (Intubation) to indicate that a person has documented intubation preferences.

Note that when an EHR records an Advance Directives Observation encoded with SNOMED CT code 52765003 (Intubation), the recorded observation does not indicate what the person's preferences were. It indicates the clinician observed that the person's advance care plan information includes preferences regarding intubation. In other words, the Advance Directives Observation in the Advance Directives section of a Clinical Summary document summarizes the types of goals, preferences and priorities in the referenced PACP document. Also, when a clinician records an observation to indicate that a type of advance care plan information exists, it is not equivalent to recording an order to perform or an order *not to perform* a certain procedure. The recording of an Advance Directives Observation only classifies the types of information available in the referenced PACP document. Within an EHR, classification of the types of available personal advance care plan information can speed clinician access to person-centered information in time-sensitive decision-making situations such as organ donation, resuscitation, or initiation of emergency department services.

**Table 8: Crosswalk between PACP Entry Types and Advance Directive Observation Types**

Code System Name		Code System OID	Version
SNOMED-CT		2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	2019-03
LOINC		2.16.840.1.113883.6.1	2.52
Personal Advance Care Plan Document Entry Type	Code System Name	Advance Directives Observation content type (2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.48 :2018-01-25)	Code System Name
entry/./code		observation/./code (see Note 1)	
75787-2 (AD-13) Thoughts on Intubation	LOINC	52765003 Intubation (procedure)	SNOMED CT
75788-0 (AD-14)	LOINC	61420007	SNOMED CT

Thoughts on Tube Feeding		Tube feeding of patient (regime/therapy)	
75789-8 (AD-15) Thoughts on Life Support	LOINC	78823007 Life support procedure (procedure)	SNOMED CT
75779-9 (AD-7) Thoughts on CPR	LOINC	89666000 Cardiopulmonary resuscitation (procedure)	SNOMED CT
75790-6 (AD-16) Thoughts on IV Fluid and Support	LOINC	14152002 Intravenous infusion (procedure)	SNOMED CT
75791-4 (AD-17) Thoughts on Antibiotics	LOINC	281789004 Antibiotics	SNOMED CT
75792-2 (AD-18) Thoughts on Resuscitation	LOINC	304251008 (note 2) Resuscitation	SNOMED CT
75793-0 (AD-19) Other Directive	LOINC	71388002 (note 2) Other Directive	SNOMED CT

Note 1: [As](#) of June, 2019, the C-CDA Advance Directive Observation template (urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.22.4.48:2022-02-14 ) has been updated to include the following conformance statement with a vocabulary binding strength that is dynamic.

1. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **code**, which **SHOULD** be selected from ValueSet [Advance Directive Type Code](#) urn:oid:2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.20.2 **DYNAMIC** (CONF:1198-8651).
  - a. This code **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] **translation** (CONF:1198-32842) such that it
    - i. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] @code="75320-2" Advance directive (CONF:1198-32843).
    - ii. **SHALL** contain exactly one [1..1] @codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.1" (CodeSystem: LOINC urn:oid:2.16.840.1.113883.6.1) (CONF:1198-32844).