Health Information Technology Advisory Committee

The Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology

Transcript

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HITAC) ADOPTED STANDARDS TASK FORCE 2022 MEETING

September 6, 2022, 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. ET

VIRTUAL

Speakers

Name	Organization	Role
Hans Buitendijk	**Oracle Cerner**	**Co-Chair**
Steven (Ike) Eichner	**Texas Department of State Health Services**	**Co-Chair**
Jeffrey Danford	Altera Digital Health	Member
Rajesh Godavarthi	MCG Health, part of the Hearst Health network	Member
Jim Jirjis	HCA Healthcare	Member
John Kilbourne	Department of Veterans Health Affair	Member
Hung S. Luu	Children's Health	Member
Clem McDonald	National Library of Medicine	Member
Deven McGraw	Invitae	Member
Eliel Oliveira	Dell Medical School, University of Texas at Austin	Member
Vassil Peytchev	Epic	Member
Samantha Pitts	Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine	Member
Alexis Snyder	Individual	Member
Fillipe Southerland	Yardi Systems, Inc.	Member
Ram Sriram	National Institute of Standards and Technology	Member
Raymonde Uy	National Association of Community Health Centers (NACHC)	Member
Debi Willis	PatientLink Enterprises	Member
Michael Berry	Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology	Designated Federal Officer
Liz Turi	Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology	ONC Staff Lead
Scott Bohon	Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology	ONC Staff Lead

Call to Order/Roll Call (00:00:00)

Michael Berry
And good morning, everyone, and welcome to the Adopted Standards Task Force. I am Mike Berry with ONC, and I would like to thank everyone for being with us today. As a reminder, your feedback is always welcomed, which can be typed in the chat feature to everyone throughout the meeting or can be made verbally during the public comment period that is scheduled at about 11:50 Eastern Time this morning. So, I am going to begin roll call of our Task Force members, and when I call your name, please indicate that you are here. Hans Buitendijk? I think Hans is still having audio issues, but we will come back to him. Steve Eichner?

Steven Eichner
Present. Good morning, all.

Michael Berry
Jeff Danford?

Jeffrey Danford
Here.

Michael Berry
Raj Godavarthi? Jim Jirjis?

Jim Jirjis
Present.

Michael Berry
John Kilbourne? Hung Luu?

Hung S. Luu
Good morning.

Michael Berry
Clem McDonald? Deven McGraw?

Deven McGraw
Here.

Michael Berry
Eliel Oliveira?

Eliel Oliveira
Here, good morning.

Michael Berry
Vassil Peytchev?

Vassil Peytchev
Here.

Michael Berry
Samantha Pitts? Alexis Snyder?

Alexis Snyder
Good morning.

Michael Berry
Fil Southerland?

Fillipe Southerland
Good morning.

Michael Berry
Ram Sriram?

Ram Sriram
Morning.

Michael Berry
Raymonde Uy?

Raymonde Uy
Good morning.

Michael Berry
And Debi Willis?

Debi Willis
Good morning.

Michael Berry
Good morning, everyone, thank you so much, and now, please join me in welcoming Hans and Steve for their opening remarks.

ONC Standards Review - Final Dispositions (00:01:53)

Steven Eichner
Good morning, all, and thank you for joining us. I hope everybody had a good Labor Day weekend and some time away from the office. I would like to thank the Task Force members for all the hard work they have done to this point, and Hans and I and some of the folks from ONC have put together a presentation summarizing all the work that we have done. We are going to go through that today in preparation for turning over our recommendations to the HITAC Task Force at the meeting coming up. We want to make

sure we have all the comments reflected well, and want really to make sure we are reflecting the Task Force's feedback, so we are glad to share what we have done this far. Hans? We can still not hear you. Still nothing. Hans can hear us, but he cannot…

Hans Buitendijk
Can you hear me now?

Steven Eichner
Yes, sir.

Hans Buitendijk
All right. Sorry about that. A little challenge with Java and Plantronics today, but I made it. So, as well, good morning. I heard Steve and Mike introduce. I also want to thank everybody for their feedback, and today, final stretch to get us over the Task Force finish line to get the dispositions/recommendations ready to go to HITAC, and then, next week, we will have the discussion with the full HITAC to request adoption of the recommendations that we have made. So, Steve, I think with that, we are ready to jump in. Shall we start with looking at the agenda? We already added final dispositions. We probably want to open up the transmittal letter that we want to step through. I see that Deven had made some comments this morning, and I am just going through, making sure nobody else… I believe there were a couple of comments from Deven.

So, what I want to do is basically ask the question whether there is anything left that is in the draft that requires substantive discussion, any edits, typos, or small clarifications that we can take care of, but if there are any major points that we need to review. So, with that, Steve, I think we wanted to go to the top, probably, and work our way, not recommendation by recommendation, but section by section, and see whether anybody has any final comments left. Deven, if there is anything that jumps out from your perspective as we get to the sections and your comments, let us know. We want to stop.

Deven McGraw
Will do.

Hans Buitendijk
All right. So, the background.

Steven Eichner
This is Steve. If anybody else has an observation as we are going through, please stop us. We do want to make sure that we are reflecting the Task Force's perspective in our recommendations.

Hans Buitendijk
All right. So, background. Any further comments? There were no further edits at the moment, but any further comments that somebody would like to make? Background of the charge, what we are aiming to achieve, and that is what we are looking at there. So, it is a general introduction. In the recommendations, we are providing on the next page more background on what we are trying to achieve, the terminology, and how we went about it. So, Deven made a number of different comments. Deven, any particular ones you feel we need to discuss?

Deven McGraw
Yeah, I was going to say I do not think any of them are substantive. There are just a few places throughout the document where the sentences were super long, and I just tried to break them up a little bit in chunks.

Hans Buitendijk
Yeah. At times, we ran into that last week. We tried to split them up as much as possible, but I am sure that we did not achieve all the splitting yet, so if somebody has any left, go for it.

Deven McGraw
Yeah, I do not think I changed the meaning anywhere. It will be easier for folks to read, I think, if it is somewhere shorter.

Hans Buitendijk
Great. That is fantastic. So then, we go to the next page, Page 6, unless there are any questions on the introduction where we described how we went about it, and here, we have effectively all our recommendations individually listed, so, the first section around data scope and vocabulary standards, where we have USCDI and all the vocabulary standards that have been used, setting scope, and the content, and unless there are any comments, it is a long section that runs all the way to almost there. It feels every time that it is still at one extra page.

Steven Eichner
Hans, this is Steve. I think the header list of recommendations did not get corrected properly. It is differentiated a little bit, but that is the title of the section, but it is not really differentiated very much from the remainder, so it may be hard to find.

Hans Buitendijk
So, maybe from a formatting perspective, adjust the size of the titles a little bit.

Steven Eichner
Yeah.

Hans Buitendijk
Okay. So, we want formatting. The next section starts on the bottom of Page 12, and that is titled “General data access standards.” These were predominantly focusing on the FHIR-based standards to get access to a variety of data in whatever set one is interested using the APIs, so, a bulk data mechanism to get access, SMART, etc. Any further comments in that space? And that runs until the top of Page 14.

Steven Eichner
Again, this is Steve. The text that we used for the rationales is very consistent across the “maintain,” “maintain with replacement,” “phase out with replacement,” so we have reused a lot of the text as far as a basis for each rationale. There may be some differences down below in a few cases where there is additional information that may be specific to that particular standard.

Hans Buitendijk

Okay, so that gets us to care coordination standards. This is a combination of some of the documents, CDA, Direct, NCPDP, e-prescribing standards that are being used to more specifically exchange information, so that runs until Page 16 at the top, so, any notes in that space where we need to pay more attention?

Steven Eichner
And the entries are labeled consistent with the ONC directory of standards, not necessarily the full name of the standard itself, in regulation.

Hans Buitendijk
And you can particularly see that here if you look at the rationale, because you are sitting on that page, the immunization messaging implementation guide. We felt that was a little bit easier to pick up on the keywords from the official name to avoid another addition to the otherwise lengthy sentences.

Okay, so that brings us to public health exchange standards. The variety of immunization, lab reporting, case reporting, etc., where appropriate, where available, or comments about them in public health. And that runs until Page No…

Steven Eichner
And, one of the differences or things we did overall with the language with public health, because a lot of that exchange occurs with non-certified systems, we pay particular attention to make a recommendation to ONC that at any point they are looking at changing the standards, to do so in strong collaboration with providers, public health, and other stakeholders.

Hans Buitendijk
All right. Then, on Page 18, in the middle, is where clinical quality measure reporting standards start, all the standards related around QRDA, Level 1, Level 2, the variety of errata, different variations of reporting that CMS uses, so that is the section where we have that, and that runs until the top of Page No. 21. Actually, I went too far because it actually is the bottom of 19. I skipped right past privacy and security standards. So, any comments on the quality measures? If not, privacy and security standards, that does run into what I mentioned earlier because I just accidentally skipped that, and that is on Page 21 at the top. That is where privacy and security runs, and then, that moves into the accessibility standards, two standards in that space to pick up on, and that runs in Page 20 to close to the bottom, and the final ones are certification process standards. And again, we will pick up on Deven's comments, work them in, and that covers the list of recommendations. Is there any one that we passed two quickly that you were thinking about that we need to go back to?

Deven McGraw
So, Hans, this is not a substantive issue, but one of the questions that I did raise on Pages 16 and 17, I think, back in the public health standards, is there was some phrasing where I thought it was just a little bit unclear what we were talking about. It is the standard that starts at the bottom of Page 16. There is this long explanation, and we sort of say "it is not incorporating," and I think it was referring to something in the previous sentence, but it was not entirely clear what, and then it says "this approach," and it is not clear what approach we are talking about since there is a lot packed into that paragraph, so I think those are just

two areas where we probably need to add a few more words to be more clear about what we are saying, and unfortunately, my recollection of the dialogue was not sharp enough that I could fill it in.

Hans Buitendijk
That is a great point. We will look at what the intent was, and Steve, I can further clarify as well that we have lab reporting, which this one is focusing at, but depending on what some of the thoughts are on how to progress case reporting, which is where the reference is to case reporting is coming in, some of the advances in lab reporting may actually be more appropriately done at that time once aligned in case reporting, but depending on the timing, if it is still needed, there is a newer version of ELR all the way into there is a newer version of lab result interfaces that includes ELR, where some of that is already addressed. So, it is a little bit of a balance between where are we going to go and at what point in time and when we are ready for what that is really that balancing act between what the right next thing is for ELR to look at. So, we need to make that clearer. That was the intent.

Deven McGraw
Yeah, I got the intent. I could see where it was going, but not precisely enough to know… Obviously, we were asking ONC to consider something if they did not incorporate the most current ELR version. It just needed something a little bit more. And then, "this approach": Which one? There was a lot that was mentioned, so we just need to be a little bit more precise.

Hans Buitendijk
Steve, do you have any other thoughts there for this discussion, or do we think that we are sufficiently on the same page in intent and we just need to work the words?

Steven Eichner
Yeah, I think it is just a matter of communication because I do not think there is a conceptual issue.

Deven McGraw
I do not think so either. Even though it gets a little bit repetitive, what I love about the way this report is framed is you could go to any particular standard and pull it out from the text and get the full recommendation, so it is very helpful, I think.

Steven Eichner
Yeah, this is a little bit different in that there are three potential viable alternatives that we know about right now, and depending on what other circumstances come into play, one or a combination might be appropriate.

Deven McGraw
Yup.

Hans Buitendijk
For example, depending on what is contained in the NPRM that is at OMB right now, as of Friday, the solution might be different.

Deven McGraw

And then, one more thought that I just had, and it could be that I have missed something, but in the very beginning of the report, we talk about how "phase out" is one if the options, the "phase out entirely." I do not think we have that anywhere, do we? I think it is either "phase out with replacement" or "maintain."

Hans Buitendijk
Let's see. I am going to jump to it.

Liz Turi
That is correct. We have no "phase out entirely."

Hans Buitendijk
Correct. And, that in itself is that we need to define it because it was an option. Then, when we get to the slides, we will summarize it. Found it. Oh, actually, we did not need that.

Deven McGraw
There were not any, okay. It is really consistent with some other language in the report, where se sort of say that it is important to have a standard. You have to have one, so this "phase out entirely" was part of the statutory language, but it seems it would be an option that a group like ours would rarely recommend.

Steven Eichner
That brings up a question that occurred to me over the weekend. The report does not include any of the tables that we have worked on for the slides. Rather than trying to modify the report, I think it might be helpful just to include the presentation formally as an appendix and include a statement in background or somewhere in the introduction that the report is included as an appendix that includes summary tables.

Hans Buitendijk
That is a good idea, and we can follow up on that to cross-pollinate that.

Steven Eichner
I raised it here just to hit some Task Force feedback about whether that would be a useful and helpful idea, and not to surprise anybody.

Hans Buitendijk
Perhaps we want to circle back to that after we go through the slides, because then we can look at which ones we are specifically talking about. Steve, would that help?

Steven Eichner
Absolutely.

Hans Buitendijk
All right. So then, there are a couple of appendixes. The first one is the roster, on Page 23, straightforward. Then, we have Appendix B, where we have only listed the names of the standards and the disposition recommendation that is the short in line with the statutory question. I did have a note around that to just double-check. There was one at one point in time that went back and forth a little bit, whether it was the best done as a "maintain" or "phase out" based on that, so I just wanted to double-check that we are still in

sync with the list above. I think we are, but I wanted to double-check. And then, at the end, there is an Appendix C with a glossary of all the acronyms used, and it is always interesting that a relatively short document of 25-ish pages can have so many acronyms in there. We are definitely an acronym-rich community in this space.

Steven Eichner
Hans, one other quick suggestion that occurred to me over the weekend is looking at the list of standards, I think it would be helpful to introduce an introductory sentence and have a link to the ONC document that has all the standards listed electronically. In case one of the URLs for any of those standards changes, it gives a second way to get to it, as well as includes the reference to where we got it from in the first place.

Hans Buitendijk
All right, we will follow up with the team on that. Sounds good. Is there anything else on the main document that we need to address before we jump to the slides that we pulled together that would serve as the summary statements? All right. Steve, do you then want to step us through the slides?

ONC Standards Review - Draft Slides (00:21:16)

Steven Eichner
It would be my pleasure. Well, what we have done with the slide deck is rather than going through each particular standard, we have kind of created it as a framework with summary groups, so the first thing we are going to do is look at going through what our presentation looks like, again, looking at coming back to the original CURES Act requirement, the charge, membership, the approach we used, how we broke things into groups, and a summary of the dispositions we have identified, so we can look through Slides 3, 4, and 5. Nothing surprising here. They are the same slides that we used in the earlier presentation, the update presentation to HITAC a few weeks ago. Again, looking at the members of the Task Force, next slide, then looking at the approach, this helped us make it a little more graphic, a little more interesting to follow, so, laying out data identification standards through the development of the draft. Next slide.

We added some color coordination to help identify the disposition state: Maintain, maintain or phase out with replacement, phase out with replacement, or phase out entirely, which, as noted earlier, does not really occur later on. So, let's go through the next couple slides. Again, looking at all standards groups, we identified that we will speak to the fact that these are not formal groups, but we did this for administrative simplification and to have an organization as we went through our review. Next slide. So, we have gotten a few summary tables or summary charts that highlight how things were distributed, and really, you can see that there are a few that are maintain, a lot that are phase out with replacement or maintain with replacement, and then, none looking at phasing out entirely. Next slide.

This breaks it out by the different groups so you can understand at a glance what the distribution looks like in terms of looking at what is maintained and what is phased out, looking at consistency in that space. Next slide. Again, this is kind of a template that we have repeated throughout the different groups, so we provide a summary description and kind of a highlight of each group, and then a snapshot of the disposition again in a graphic, so, group highlights for data description vocabulary include USCDI can advance, but it needs to be aligned, SNOMED and LOINC should have one version throughout regulation for consistency, there needs to be a resolution to the way that OMB race and ethnicity standard is specified, which currently refers to Document 15 as revised, but it is a little unclear as to which versions actually apply, and looking at the

vocabulary advancement process is very valuable, enabling folks to move forward between regulatory actions.

Then, we go through and list each standard and its disposition. Basically, the same chart or the same table that appears in the current report. Next slide. Then, looking at general data access standards, the highlight is recommending maintaining the standard while starting to explore advancement as appropriate so we do not get too far ahead with a FHIR standard that is not supported in practice, and again, looking at the dispositions for the standards within the group. So, again, the next slide is the disposition for the standards in the grouping, and we should note that the reference numbers are the same as what is in the table in the report. We did not renumber them 1 through X for each standard group.

Looking at care coordination, again, you can see the group highlights and the disposition. I am going to give everybody a chance to look at the group highlight and reflect on whether there is anything else that needs to get mentioned. We might want to change the spacing and description. It looks like it is 0.7 and group highlights are a full 1. That might be something to look at throughout just to make sure we got the spacing correct. And again, looking at the next slide is the list for the standards within that group, and then the disposition recommendation. Looking at the next slide, looking at public health exchange standards, again, looking at alignment between stakeholders is critical. We probably also want to include laboratory reporting in the sub-bullet list. And, as we discussed a moment ago with Deven, looking at the opportunity for what is going to happen with LRI, should that be more abstracted because there are multiple choices there, and it is not just a matter of the ELR IG?

Hans Buitendijk
That was the intent of the last couple words, but with space limitation. We may want to expand it just a little bit.

Steven Eichner
Right. Well, if we change it to “laboratory results have opportunities,” because it is not just about the ELR IG, it is about laboratory results, or maybe it is even just laboratory reporting.

Hans Buitendijk
And then, say “with multiple choices.”

Steven Eichner
Yeah. “Presents opportunities” instead of “have.”

Hans Buitendijk
That still looks fairly readable.

Steven Eichner
Yeah, I think that is still 0.7 spaced, but that is okay. Any comments or additional feedback? Looking at the next slide, again, is the list of standards that are included in public health reporting. We did note that…sorry. Looking at PDMP, prescription drug management, this can fit both into care coordination and public health reporting. It is included in care coordination. Looking at the next slide, again, clinical quality measures, and again, noting that it needs to be updated to be consistent with CMS’s quality reporting standards, again,

looking at the disposition, again, it is reflective of the material in the report, and again, the list of appropriate standards.

Looking at the next slide, looking at privacy and security standards, noting that they are well established, and also noting that we discussed the security hash standard, and making sure that our recommendations include that CHA-1 is disallowed if it is just maintained. And again, looking at dispositions. Next slide. Again, it is just the list of standards. Following onto the next slide, which is accessibility, and again, we have noted that we consulted with Office of Civil Rights to ask if there was an opportunity or a need to change anything to align with other OCR efforts. We need a period after that R.

Liz Turi
So, we do not have periods after any of them, so it would be consistent with all of the highlights that we have.

Steven Eichner
No worries. And again, the dispositions are reflective of the Task Force's analysis and listing of the accessibility standards. On to the next slide. We did not identify any group highlight, row certification, process standards, they were kind of perfunctory and necessary for certification, but we did not find anything to change about the standards, and they should be maintained as necessary, and again, the listing of the relevant standards. Onto the next slide.

On the next slide, we did put together some key takeaways that are not reflected currently in language in the report. The first takeaway was that we found that regulated areas have standards, and there is ongoing need for the identification of standards for use, kind of reflecting the idea that we do not say it head-on. Maybe we could add a point that we found no standard that should be retired without replacement, recognizing the SVAP process allows for technology advancement, but there may be some risks involved if the new standard is not backwards compatible, because if the SVAP advancement is not consistent and everybody is not moving up or everyone who is trading data is not moving to a new standard and there is limited or no backwards compatibility, that can create some challenges on exchange.

Looking at maintaining references to accurate standards is a living project, and really needs to be ongoing so that we are monitoring and understanding the interrelationship between standards so that it is not being done in a haphazard process. Noting that the CURES Act process can result in duplicative work or redundant work because in order to identify a standard that might be retired or replaced, you need to consider what the utility of that standard is, and is there something that might actually be around to replace it? And then, once you enter the rulemaking process, you then need to reidentify whether there are alternatives.

Hans Buitendijk
And the timing of that could be months, could be a year. We do not know what that is, so that is part of that question, and maybe the bullet twice below, "currently inefficient to just talk," maybe we can merge that together with that bullet. It is about the same topic of if this is the most optimum way to validate where we are at and where we should be.

Steven Eichner

As an example, looking at the laboratory results reporting piece, if you were to replace today, you might go one path, and if you were to replace it next year, there might be a little more maturity and you might choose to go a different path, and that is where we know there are several that are currently in development, let alone other standards where there may be some relevant content being developed that we are not aware of. The next one is a piece for discussion for the Task Force as to whether we should report out the limit of the review system. Hans, do you want to talk about that a little bit more?

Hans Buitendijk
Yeah, I am trying to understand a little bit better what the limit of the system is. Is it the review system that was intended here, Steve, or was it a different system?

Steven Eichner
It is the review system.

Hans Buitendijk
And I think that goes back to, then, that same question on the one above, so we want to probably blend that in, that it is the review process that is the question mark. Are we approaching this most efficiently at the right time? Because depending on when this review is done and when the actual rules are being contemplated, is it too late, too soon, or should it be together? Because as Steve also indicated, the time that you ask the question "Should I phase it out or maintain?" is effectively the question "Do I have something else that I can replace it with? If not, I need to maintain it." So, you have to start to get into that conversation that we actually did, but we only tipped our toe into it. It was not a full-blown discussion of exactly what we would recommend. So, are we essentially going to be retracing some of those steps at the time that the rules process comes around?

Steven Eichner
The second piece of it is with the SVAP process in place, also the good side or the availability of the process to enable advancement between regulatory updates as kind of a good thing in terms of being able to modernize, but also, the other side of that coin, as mentioned earlier, looking at the potential limits, if different vendors adopt a process or standard including SVAP in a manner inconsistent with other vendors, how does that impact interoperability, and of course, that is one of the purposes of the standards in the first place. So, do we touch on both?

Hans Buitendijk
We could. We then get further away from the original scope, perhaps, because the question, then, is that happens not only with SVAP, it also happens with the regulation itself. As that moves up, you have the same kind of questions, although some of that time might get closer together, but backwards capability remains a challenge no matter when you are going to go up. SVAP has its variants of challenges, as we start to learn, and regulation has its challenges, so it is never going to be perfect, but we need to move forward, so what is the best balance that we have?

Steven Eichner
Yeah. I do not think it is a matter of A or B, it is a matter of acknowledging their choices, the impacts of the choices, and what to do to move forward.

Hans Buitendijk
Right. And I think the key point here is assessing that and understanding that is technically out of scope of the charter, yet it is important to understand what is a good recommendation of maintaining or phasing out because they relate, and I think it is a good example of the challenge you run into if you disconnect the two.

Steven Eichner
Right, and I think it gets exacerbated when you look at trading data with technologies that are not part of the certification program.

Hans Buitendijk
Right. So, any thoughts from others on how to further highlight or clarify this point, or do others believe that that is not really a concern of this being somewhat removed from the actual timing of when we can dive deeper into actual recommendations of what a new standard or replacement standard would look like? Any other thoughts on that? Should we emphasize this more, less, or differently, or are we okay with this? I am not hearing pushback in either direction. Steve, I think we will clean this up a little bit more. I heard somebody joining. Clem, you are on mute again. Sorry, we just heard you for a second. There you are.

Clem McDonald
I think we need some simple, overarching rules because these things can dig around forever and find additional complexities. I think something like "standards should be reviewed for new versions every X time, and the new versions should be…" In many cases, you have already said the new versions would be automatically acceptable, and maybe that would be the best rule to have, because mostly we are talking about versions of the same standard, not one standard replacing another standard.

Hans Buitendijk
Yeah. The latter part is that there is one that jumps out as a potential, and it would only be in part at this point in time. That is ELR case reporting because there is a little bit of a balancing of what is the best flow, but otherwise, I agree. You are looking at a new standard, and then, for example, if you take the question we are currently on FHIR R.5, jumping to an R.5, R.4b, or R.6 is a big question, and that requires a lot of forethought because that introduces different complexities than, say, going from a QRDA 1 Version X to Version Y. They might be close together, and we will find those variances. The SVAP process helps with staging that further, but we have also found that there are newer versions available that are not yet in SVAP, so SVAP cannot be the only indicator that we are ready because it is not yet in SVAP. Maybe next year.

Steven Eichner
Right, and the other chance with SVAP is that it is voluntary, which is a great thing in a lot of ways, except the challenge is when you are actually looking at exchanging data across trading partners, have all the trading partners advanced to the current SVAP-included process?

Hans Buitendijk
Right.

Clem McDonald
A lot of that is decided by the market, though. Whatever we say does not matter. If people do not like it, it will not be adopted.

Hans Buitendijk
Yeah, and I think in public health, there are some good examples. In order to move, you need to have everybody on the same page, whether they use certified software or not, to make that happen. In other areas, and I will just go flip to the other side, you have the usability/accessibility standards, WCAG, which is much more internal to a system, so you do not have a lot of dependencies, and everything in between. So, we are dealing with a spectrum of impacts. Depending on what is happening, it is fine if somebody moves, and in other areas, it is not so great if only one party moves.

Clem McDonald
Exactly. There is not a uniform answer. If any particular vendor doing a lot of exchange between providers using its system wants to elevate to an SVAP and it is effectively trading internally, great, fantastic. If it impacts other trading partners, they need to be on board as well.

Hans Buitendijk
Right. So, it sounds like we are okay with this. We want to perhaps identify, based on Clem's comments, a little bit more that it needs to be a flowing process. Frequently, it is a 5333, but it needs to be ongoing, and where we can be automatic, great, we are doing it for vocabulary, the latest version can always be adopted, or perhaps there are other places one could do that, but we have to balance that with if one moves and the other has to move as well, something has to be more locked into an agreed-to common timeframe as opposed to everybody on their own.

Clem McDonald
That is a good point.

Hans Buitendijk
Okay, other comments on this? Steve, I think we have two bullets left on the bottom.

Steven Eichner
Looking at our maintain/phase out appropriate questions, and that kind of reflects back to the process that we kind of identified earlier that maintaining or phasing out has two choices without modifiers. Is that really a sufficient analysis? I think as we discovered through the process, you are probably **[inaudible – background noise] [00:45:24]** beyond maintain or phase out because there are few places, or we did not identify any places, where there was a simple phase-out that there is no need for current regulatory reference, that we are not yet in a place where everything might be truly voluntary.

Hans Buitendijk
And perhaps the recommendation there is the refined approach that we took allows for the variety of what "phase out" may mean, although it is not likely that we will find many, so far none, that would be an entire phase-out. Based on the nature of what we are doing here, a full phase-out is not a likely thing. Now, we have seen in the past that based on certain criteria, like LRI, for example, was fully phased out for a particular purpose of use, and at this point in time, it is being questioned whether that was an appropriate move or not, so it still is a valid thing to consider, but the question is how frequently? So, perhaps we want to put a suggestion, not only an open question, that "maintain" and "phase out" should be looked at more

discretely than we have done moving forward, not just "maintain and phase out," because the latter not frequently happen, if at all.

Steven Eichner
Right. As we found, it is more of a continuum.

Hans Buitendijk
Yup, so we probably want to restate it as a statement, not as a question, in that direction based on our learning.

Steven Eichner
I think if we reflect it as a continuum, again, acknowledging, in many ways, the SVAP and other processes in the middle, it is not necessarily purely regulatory in action that is reliant solely on the regulatory process to establish a standard, but at the same time, there is an evolving standards environment, and at least for now, there needs to be some regulatory involvement so that there is a floor.

Hans Buitendijk
Do we have enough material to make that a little bit clearer, or do we have other comments on this before we can move to the last bullet? I think we are on the last one, Steve, except for the little situation we ran into.

Steven Eichner
Yup. The last one is the observation that the Task Force could not fully evaluate all standards because there were some, or one in particular, that was not publicly available for review. In other words, there was a fee for accessing the language of the standard, and without having access to the standard, we could not really evaluate the standard's contents. That is not suggesting that all standards should be free, that is simply putting a limit in this space that we cannot do what we cannot see.

Hans Buitendijk
Right. Any other takeaways that we want to present to the HITAC committee?

Steven Eichner
Now, again, these takeaways are not currently reflected in the body of the report. They are included only in the slide deck. Does the Task Force suggest that we include these as additional text in the body of the report? Should we just include these as takeaways in the slide deck, and should we include the slide deck as another appendix to the report? I recognize that it does duplicate the listing of standards.

Hans Buitendijk
Maybe an in-between suggestion is that we put the key takeaways and summary statistics into the document, but not the rest of the slide deck, because it is all otherwise in there, but those are the two things or two types of information that are not in the document yet, and therefore, we could copy them in there, and then the slide deck is just a select subset of the document that we present on. Would that be a reasonable way so that it is clearly part of the transmittal letter, yet it is also then a good pullout for the slides? I am hearing somebody. I am not sure whether it is a yes, agreed, or somebody breaking up.

Ram Sriram
Can you hear me now?

Hans Buitendijk
Yes, I can hear you.

Ram Sriram
I agree with the approach. Put the takeaways in the document because the rest of the stuff is already there.

Hans Buitendijk
Yup. Similarly with the summary statistics on how many we found, put them up in a summary or in the appendix that people can look at? Unless there are objections to that, we will do that, so we have that there, and then we can use the graph or this format. Okeydoke. Steve, anything else? I think we got to the end, and we have our marching orders on the slide deck to clean it up, last cleanups to the document. Anything else that we need to do?

Steven Eichner
I would agree with you. I think we are ready for any public comments.

Hans Buitendijk
Unless there is anything else from the Task Force that you believe we missed that we still need to address before we pass it to Mike.

Steven Eichner
I do not have anything. Are there any points that the Task Force members would like to raise?

Hans Buitendijk
I will take the resounding quiet as “We are good to go.”

Steven Eichner
So, for clarity’s sake, when do we want to consider the draft locked for Task Force comment?

Hans Buitendijk
The end of the day today, last comments based on this, and then we finalize and wrap it up? Is that a good time limit? Liz, would that work from your perspective as well, if we give it the rest of the day, and then, tomorrow morning, we have it locked in?

Liz Turi
Yeah, that works for me.

Hans Buitendijk
All right. Steve, I think we can pass it to Mike.

Steven Eichner

So, just to clarify, all Task Force members, please make any final comments on the draft report by close of day today, and Hans and I will work with Liz and ONC folks through tomorrow and produce the final report. As soon as it is available in final form and it is released to the Task Force, we will ask Liz and company to send it out to the Task Force, consistent with ONC rules and regulations for that kind of stuff.

Hans Buitendijk
Great.

Public Comment (00:53:23)

Michael Berry
All right. I just wanted to note that the document may be locked currently to Task Force members, but we will be sure to unlock it so that you can make any needed edits by the end of today. So, we are going to go to public comment, and if you are on Zoom and would like to make a comment, please use the hand raise function, which is located on the Zoom toolbar at the bottom of your screen. If you are on the phone only, press *9 to raise your hand, and once called upon, press *6 to mute and unmute your line. So, let's pause to see if we have anyone raise their hand. I am not seeing any hands raised, Hans and Steve, so I will turn it back to you.

Next Steps (00:54:04)

Hans Buitendijk
Great, all right, then if we are looking at next steps, we already talked about a couple of those. The final comments are really not substantive, but just if you find a sentence that does not run that we just need to fix, those would be great. We have passed the point for substantive comments beyond what we discussed today. And then, the next step is that Steve and I, with the team, will finalize that and get it out, ready for the HITAC next week, where we will present this with the request to accept the recommendations, perhaps with some additions from HITAC members and discussion at that point in time, but that will then formally wrap up this Task Force. But, before next week, I already want to clearly extend my thanks to all the Task Force members for your input and to the ONC team to help pull this together, and as the first time of doing this type of an activity in accordance with the HITAC or with the CURES Act and get that process going as well, so, thank you very much. Steve?

Steven Eichner
I would like to echo and emphasize the great work the Task Force managed to accomplish in the last few weeks since it began its work. I think we did a lot of good work, and it will be very useful for HITAC and ONC, and I am incredibly appreciative of the input of each and every one of you, as well as the support team available through ONC. It has been an absolute pleasure to help move this forward. I am not sure that we actually need to meet next week, given the great work that the Task Force has done. If Hans agrees, I think we can release time for next week's meeting. Again, we will follow up with any necessary email, but I think that is okay, and again, my gratitude and appreciation for all parties involved: Presenters, Task Force members, and support staff.

Hans Buitendijk
Thank you. All right, then, we will close today.

Steven Eichner
Hans, do we want to release from next week?

Hans Buitendijk
Do we want to wait and see until tomorrow that we know for sure if anything came back? It is more than likely that tomorrow, you will see a cancellation for that meeting.

Steven Eichner
I will amend my suggestion based on whether there is any substantive comment that comes in through the end of the day. If there are no pieces that we need to discuss with the Task Force, if what we get back are all grammatical issues, we will take care of that, but if there is anything of substance, we may have a short meeting next week.

Hans Buitendijk
All right, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Liz Turi
Thank you both.

Adjourn (00:57:19)