Transcript

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HITAC) INTEROPERABILITY STANDARDS WORKGROUP MEETING

January 30, 2024 10 – 11:30 AM ET

VIRTUAL

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Sarah DeSilvey, Gravity Project, Co-Chair
Steven (Ike) Eichner, Texas Department of State Health Services, Co-Chair
Pooja Babbrah, Point-of-Care Partners
Ricky Bloomfield, Apple
Hans Buitendijk, Oracle Health
Keith Campbell, Food and Drug Administration
Christina Caraballo, HIMSS
Grace Cordovano, Enlightening Results
Raj Dash, College of American Pathologists
Steven Lane, Health Gorilla
Hung Luu, Children's Health
Anna McCollister, Individual
Katrina Miller Parrish, Humana Health Insurance
Kikelomo Oshunkentan, Pegasystems
Rochelle Prosser, Orchid Healthcare Solutions
Mark Savage, Savage & Savage LLC
Fillipe Southerland, Yardi Systems, Inc.
Shelly Spiro, Pharmacy Health Information Technology Collaborative
Naresh Sundar Rajan, CyncHealth

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Medell Briggs-Malonson, UCLA Health
Derek De Young, Epic
Lee Fleisher, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine
Hannah Galvin, Cambridge Health Alliance
Rajesh Godavarthi, MCG Health, part of the Hearst Health network
Jim Jirjis, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Aaron Neinstein, Notable
Zeynep Sumer-King, New York-Presbyterian

ONC STAFF

Seth Pazinski, Director, Strategic Planning & Coordination Division, ONC
Wendy Noboa, Designated Federal Officer, ONC
Al Taylor, Office of Technology, ONC

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

Seth Pazinski
All right, good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Interoperability Standards Workgroup meeting. I am Seth Pazinski with ONC, and I want to thank everybody for joining today. I will be serving as the designated federal officer for today's call on behalf of Wendy Noboa, and as a reminder, all workgroup meetings are open to the public, and public feedback is welcome throughout. Members of the public can type their comments in the Zoom chat feature throughout the meeting, or there will be time towards the end of the agenda to make verbal comments from the public as well. We are going to start off our meeting with roll call of the workgroup members, so when I say your name, please indicate that you are present. I will start with the co-chairs. Sarah DeSilvey?

Sarah DeSilvey
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Steve Eichner?

Steven Eichner
Present, good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Pooja Babbrah?

Pooja Babbrah
Good morning, I am here.

Seth Pazinski
Ricky Bloomfield?

Ricky Bloomfield
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Medell Briggs-Malonson? Hans Buitendijk? Sorry, go ahead, Sarah.

Sarah DeSilvey
I was just noting that Medell wrote ahead that she would not be able to attend.

Seth Pazinski
Okay, thank you. Hans Buitendijk? Keith Campbell? Christina Caraballo?

Christina Caraballo
Present.

Seth Pazinski
Grace Cordovano?

Grace Cordovano
Here, good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Raj Dash?

Raj Dash
Here, good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Derek De Young? Lee Fleisher? Hannah Galvin messaged that she was going to be absent from today's call. Raj Godavarthi? Jim Jirjis? Steven Lane?

Steven Lane
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Hung Luu?

Hung S. Luu
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Anna McCollister? Katrina Miller Parrish?

Katrina Miller Parrish
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Aaron Neinstein? Kikelomo Oshunkentan?

Kikelomo Oshunkentan
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Rochelle Prosser?

Rochelle Prosser
Present, good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Mark Savage?

Mark Savage
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Fil Southerland?

Fillipe Southerland
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Shelly Spiro?

Shelly Spiro
Good morning.

Seth Pazinski
Good morning. Zeynep Sumer-King? Naresh Sundar Rajan? Naresh, if you are on, you are on mute. I see that you have joined. Okay, that completes our roll call for today. I want to thank you, and please join me in welcoming Sarah and Ike for their opening remarks.

Opening Remarks (00:03:37)

Sarah DeSilvey
Ike, would you like to go first, or do you want me to start?

Steven Eichner
Go for it, please.

Sarah DeSilvey
I am just going to welcome you all again to the work of our IS WG. I hope you all were not too overwhelmed by the homework that we sent in advance. I was really trying to make sure that you all had the historical information that you will need to commence our work today. We are very much looking forward to the work of this year's IS WG, and we are going to make sure that by the end of this meeting, every single person in this workgroup has an understanding of the process so that we can make sure your wisdom is laid to bear on the task at hand. Ike?

Steven Eichner
I would like to echo what my co-chair said. We are excited to get this stuff going. We have some really good material to work with, and hopefully we will get stuff done and get recommendations prepared for HITAC.

Sarah DeSilvey
Thank you so much. All right, back to you, Seth. Should we go through the agenda, Seth? Would that be helpful?

Seth Pazinski

Yes, that would be great, thanks.

Sarah DeSilvey
Okay. We wanted to spend a little bit of time today reviewing past HITAC recommendations again because there were lots of really thoughtful comments in the chat, with new members trying to understand context, and we talked a lot about the cycle of elevating things from Level 2 up into formal USCDI recommendations, and then Al will go over workgroup planning and review resources and how the work really happens. We will go through workgroup discussions. We did have some questions for you that we sent in the homework. One of the things we want, just from a timing perspective, is if there are external members that are in the ecosystem, we want to make sure we bring them into our group to help us lay evidence and context to some of our conversations. We want to identify them early. We sent that in the email, but we will also be discussing that a little bit today, then we will go into public comment, and then we will adjourn. Any questions on the agenda? All right, next slide. Ike, would you like to cover this, or do you want me to go?

Steven Eichner
Go for it.

Sarah DeSilvey
Okay. Every time we commence our meeting, we do remind ourselves of the charge. Our charge as the Interoperability Standards Workgroup is to review and provide recommendations on the draft for United States Core Data for Interoperability, Version 5. Specifically, it is to evaluate the draft from all of our points of expertise, and there is a really diverse group of people here with lots of really critical perspectives, from patient perspectives, pharmacy, laboratory, clinical perspectives, and different roles within the clinical ecosystem, and then to comment on and evaluate that draft v.5 for the new data classes and elements from draft USCDI v.5 that should be considered for the final USCDI v.5 release, and then to discuss any Level 2 data classes and elements not included in draft USCDI v.5 that should be considered for the final USCDI v.5 release.

Again, trying to orient new members to the process and understanding how frankly overwhelming it was to come in last year as a new member and a co-chair, it really can be helpful to review last year's transmittal letter on those Level 2 data classes that we discussed last year and see if they are appropriate for reconsideration this year. All of this is due by April 11th so that we can transfer our recommendations to HITAC for consideration. Any questions on the charge? Ike, did I leave anything out that you want to add context to?

Steven Eichner
I think you hit it all beautifully.

Sarah DeSilvey
Wonderful. Any questions from the community on the charge? All right, next slide. Again, we are going to briefly discuss some context, and then we will go through to the bulk of the presentation, which is Al presenting on how the work gets done, and then we will have open discussion at the end, both internally within IS WG and opening it up for public comment. Next slide. Oh, there is actually no slide. My apologies, I thought there were slides in there, but mostly, we just wanted to make sure that the ecosystem was aware

of the past transmittal letter, past IS WG recommendations, and past HITAC recommendations, as evidenced by the logos on the USCDI element. Seth, am I missing anything?

Overview of Past HITAC Recommendations (00:08:46)

Seth Pazinski
Accel, can you pull up the Google working document that just shows the crosswalk that was put together? So, what ONC did was take a look at all of the past HITAC recommendations from prior USCDI versions and how those recommendations have translated from last year into the final Version 4 of USCDI or now into the draft Version 5, which obviously is not final at this point. That is just a way for you folks to familiarize yourselves with how the past HITAC work has translated into the most recent versions of USCDI. So, I will give a chance to Sarah or Ike if there is anything in particular they want to highlight, but I will offer it to Al Taylor if there is anything in particular he wants to highlight on this background information initially, and then maybe we can pause and see if folks have any questions about this.

Sarah DeSilvey
The only thing I want to note is the specific elements that were discussed, and again, my apologies that we asked for this. With the specific elements that were in discussion when we presented draft USCDI last week, we had conversation regarding the elements that came out of Gender Harmony, and also in the chat was a conversation regarding the diagnostic imaging elements that were discussed last year in IS WG. And so, this table can be really helpful context for seeing how those conversations have been discussed in past IS WGs or recommended in past transmittal letters, and I really want to promote that from a time and ease perspective, it may be appropriate to directly reference a past recommendation.

For instance, on those formerly Level 2 Gender Harmony-aligned ones like pronoun elements, name elements, and sex for clinical use elements, it might be wise to look back at what we said last year and see if it is appropriate, and if we all accept it, then we can include it and then go forward. If not, of course, we can always have further discussion, but it might save time and aid in efficiency to reference the labor of past workgroups. Ike, anything else to say on that?

Steven Eichner
Just to build on that, we can certainly use past work as a reference, and not only can we reflect the exact comments that were made in previous years, but we can certainly use that as a foundation. If things have changed in the last year or last couple of years, we can certainly reflect that change on what a recommendation might look like going forward. The past work is obviously a point in time, and we know the environment has changed subsequently, so we have some flexibility there. It is not that we have to pick it up and move it over. We can use it as a foundation.

Sarah DeSilvey
Thank you, Ike. Mark?

Mark Savage
Thanks. I just want to lift up a comment that has been in the chat in the past meeting. It is great to have this; I appreciate it. It also will be very helpful for us as a workgroup to hear why past work did not make it over the hurdle. We do not necessarily know that, and we always give our best, and it ends up being a

unanimous recommendation from HITAC, so some feedback that lets us know where the points of concern or whatever are would be really helpful for us to be successful here. Thank you.

Sarah DeSilvey
Thank you, Mark. Again, my apologies for not setting it up well, but I hear the benefit of this resource, especially for new members who do not hold the history in their mind, which is great, but it is seen as something that can assist us. Of course, Ike and I cannot answer to why those things were not included. We also hear Ike echoing what is really important, like the process. It would not be that the past recommendations would be automatically included, but they might save us some labor and serve as a reference to refine and go forward with recommendations for 2024. Al, is there anything else you want to say on this resource or on Mark's comments and what Grace and Steven Lane are elevating in the chat?

Al Taylor
Sorry, I have not looked at the whole chat, but to Mark's comment, I just want to reiterate what I said last week to the same comment. All of the data elements that were considered, which really was the whole universe of Level 2 data elements, including recent submissions and past submissions, were taken into account, and once we had all those 120-some Level 2 data elements under consideration, we then applied the prioritization criteria that were shown, and we had to select a relatively small list. The main reason that some of these data elements did not get in was because they just missed out on being on the short list. There were some that we considered to have a narrower use case, and I do not have list of ones that might not be considered truly core for the whole country, but I know that some of them did fall into that category of being less than widely applicable, so that is my only comment about why these or any other data elements did not make the list.

Sarah DeSilvey
Mark, I know some of the elements that you are considering, and what I hope we can do over the course of our time is lean into specifics regarding specific elements, like if we feel like we want to re-elevate concepts from Level 2 from last year and have discussion again, maybe we can have more specifics on what might have not let it go forward from the transmittal letter into USCDI v.5 last year, so instead of having broad conversations, I really would love to hear specific conversations on some of the elements that came out of the care plan work and diagnostic imaging work last year, should the IS WG want to elevate them again. Does that make sense as an approach, friends, so that we can try to understand context when we are talking about the specific elements in our work going forward, instead of generally? Anna?

Anna McCollister
I just wanted to elevate this issue again. To the point that Mark made, I think it would be really helpful if ONC could give back to HITAC, at least, especially an overview of why the various elements were accepted or not accepted because it is really difficult to get your head around sometimes. Some of this stuff seems so incredibly basic, but understanding the logic as to why this stuff is not included is a little challenging at times. I do not live and breathe this stuff, but I am pretty close to it, or certainly closer than most people in the broader public, so it would be really helpful to understand the logic.

Steven Eichner
This is Steve. I think an alternative to going measure by measure or element by element and explaining why a particular element was not included might be a quick refresher on what concepts are being prioritized

and looking at what elements are being included, so, looking at scope impact and size or utility impact, and that may influence what information the workgroup includes in its recommendation to help ONC make a better-informed decision. So, if there is a particular element that has a much larger impact than might have been originally perceived, that would be useful information in helping ONC improve the information available to it as it makes its decisions.

Sarah DeSilvey
Ike, that is a very good point. First of all, I hear many people saying they did not see this prior, and to be honest, I did not, either. I had said it would be beneficial, so I think we are going to send it again, and it probably just the hazard of emails, but we will recirculate it again to everybody else. We did ask for it as something like this analysis, and it has been asked for in the past because it has been really helpful for orienting and grounding, so that will be recent to everybody, but one of the things I want to hold space for, though I am going to get to your question, Anna, is it might be helpful now to maintain this historical reference and pivot to AI, who will walk through exactly what Ike was saying, the current USCDI v.5 draft in the Google doc, how we do the labor, how people are commenting, and some of the columns that represent some of the considerations that are brought to bear from a standard space perspective. Ike, do you think that is a good idea, so that we can get to the work of 2024?

Steven Eichner
I think that is a wonderful idea. I did see a question in the chat about the Google worksheet. We will get to that in a little bit, but I want to acknowledge questions there about how one accesses the worksheet we are using for comments. We will get there.

Sarah DeSilvey
Fantastic. Anna, do you have any questions on this document before we pivot to the working Google Drive document for USCDI draft v.5?

Anna McCollister
No, we can move on. I think the more explanation that you can give to us about why something was accepted or not accepted, the better, because when I talk to other patients or people who are interested in this, even people who are pretty well-informed about this stuff, and tell them about laboratory values and some of these things are just not included, even though they were recommended, their mind kind of is like, “What on earth have we been doing over the past several years?” It is not logical to somebody who is not involved in the weeds, so, to the extent to which that logic could be exposed, it would be very helpful and informative.

Sarah DeSilvey
That makes a lot of sense. What I hear consistently in the chat and from the questions is a continued desire for transparency on how decisions are made regarding what gets into final drafts of USCDI versus what comes out of the labor of this committee. Does that seem fair to say?

Anna McCollister
Yes. It is out of respect for the amount of time that people devote to this as well.

Sarah DeSilvey

Noted, and again, this is partly what is represented in this document, is the history of that, too, not just one episode of an IS WG, but over time. That is noted, appreciated, and echoed, and I hear you. Hopefully, we will continue to move toward that work. And now, Al is going to take us to this year's labor in the Google doc that will be our work for draft USCDI v.5.

IS WG Planning and Review Resources (00:21:28)

Al Taylor
Thank you, Sarah, and thanks to everybody. I am also going to answer some questions that came up last time that tend to keep coming up. We are going to talk a little bit about the relationship between USCDI, US Core, and the C-CDA IGs, and the timeline related to that relationship. I will talk about navigating the USCDI website, how to submit public comments, which will be helpful to understand how they come in and what we do with them once we get them, and then, I will talk a little bit about the standards bulletin as a resource to guide any comments that may come in on draft v.5, and then, part of the standards bulletin includes asking some specific questions. We are going to get into those specific questions that are more specific than the general charges that Sarah just went over. So, the next slide shows the C-CDA releases that directly support or implement, as I said here, different versions of USCDI. So, Versions 1, 2, and 3 are supported by Companion Guide Releases 2, 3, and 4.1. We called it 4.1 because they released a modification based on some issues with USCDI Version 3, and then how Release 4 represented it.

What is missing here is Version 4. Version 4 is represented by two IGs that are still in ballot reconciliation. They have not been finalized, so they are not listed here, but they are in ballot reconciliation, so once they become final and published, we will be able to add these to the list to show the relationship between C-CDA and USCDI versions. The next slide shows the relationship between USCDI and US Core, and these are the versions of US Core related to the versions of USCDI. There are two for USCDI Version 1 because there was an update to complete the task on US Core to fully represent what was in USCDI Version 1.

The next slide is complicated, and I apologize for it. This is a slide that HL7 put together, and it shows the timing relationship between USCDI and, in this example, US Core. This shows and hopefully explains the lag time between our publication of USCDI and the availability to adopt a particular version of USCDI. So, we publish our drafts in January, we publish our final in July, we published our final v.4 last July, and then the process to develop the US Core IG began. It did not begin before that because HL7 was very busy publishing this version, US Core 6.0.1. So, there is a significant lag, and that is why health IT developers cannot adopt or update their systems to USCDI because the implementing IGs are not yet available. This cycle continues, and the ballot reconciliation IG for US Core is 7.0, and there is a corresponding IG working its way through ballot reconciliation for C-CDA as well.

So, hopefully, this explains the timeline and the lag, but what I think bears repeating is that most of the time, USCDI leads to the development of the content in US Core. When we publish a final version, we do that only after a great deal of consideration of the impact on health IT developers, standards developers, implementers, and providers, and we have done a lot of research to estimate that what we have added to a version of USCDI is a reasonable burden in all of those areas. We do not simply publish new data elements in a final version and hope that HL7 can catch up. We fully believe that what we put out is a reasonable amount of standards development burden and health IT development burden as well. Next slide.

So, this shows the cycle. I think I have shown this before, but it is a continuous process. This is only showing the USCDI cycles, and we intend to publish the final version of v.5 after consideration of this body's work and all of the public comments that we get over the next three months, and we will attempt to reconcile all of those comments and publish USCDI Version 5, the final version. Next slide.

The first main bullet outlines the questions that we ask during this public feedback period, and it also is reflected in the workgroup charges. As a reminder, the deadline for public comments is April 15th, and that aligns with the workgroup's timeline and delivery of their final recommendations to the HITAC on the 12th of April, but in particular, the input we are asking for from the public, which is in a little bit more detail than what we put in the charges and hopefully the same as what we will get from the HITAC, is on the data elements that we added to draft v.5 and whether there are changes that should be made to those. Anything is fair game for recommendations or comments on things that should change. Did we not get the definition right, which does not define the scope well? Did we provide examples in usage notes that make sense and help implementers implement it? Was the applicable standard appropriate, or should other vocabulary terminology standards be considered?

In addition to the comments that we are looking for on draft v.5, the new data elements in particular, we are also looking for any comments on Level 2 data elements, and I showed the entire universe of Level 2 data elements on last week's session, but are there things that we may have missed? That could include the ones that Mark and Anna were talking about. Those are HITAC-recommended data elements that did not make draft v.5 or other data elements that many of the members feel should be reconsidered. In addition to those comments on specific data elements, we are looking for feedback on what are perceived to be the potential barriers for development and implementation of these data elements. We are asking a broad set of questions.

In addition to this broad set of questions, we are also asking about three in particular. Because of our adding it, we are not 100% sure how it should be scoped, and in particular with the provenance data element, because we previously proposed author before publishing USCDI Version 1 four years ago, one of the reasons we did not adopt that particular data element in USCDI Version 1 is because we got a lot of feedback that the infrastructure was not technically ready for assigning and exchanging author for all data elements, and we propose it again because of the increased focus on patient-generated data and how to designate that particular data is patient-generated, came from a patient, a provider, a device, or a family member, and we feel like author and author role combined would help communicate that particular aspect of data and be able to capture specifically that data is patient-generated. We are also looking to see what has changed since 2020, when it was proposed, as far as the technical infrastructure readiness for author. There has been a lot of work on provenance over the last four years, and we want to hear from folks how much of that work has been implemented.

The next one is not quite as deep of a question. As most people know, lot number can apply not just to immunizations, though it definitely does. It can apply to other medications that might be recalled or involved with any medication safety events after initial marketing. So, we have it currently listed as immunization data element, but as we have said before, having a data element in one data class does not prevent its use. This concept of lot number is not unique to immunizations should it be scoped to be broader, even if it stays in the immunization data class, so we are looking for feedback on that particular question.

Finally, there is test kit unique device identifier. This was previously recommended by the HITAC and many others, and we are looking for feedback on the extent in particular scenarios and workflows in which this particular data element would be useful, and we are asking the question about this particular one because test kit unique identifier is one of several different kinds of specific unique device identifiers, a test kit being a UDI-labeled product, and so, this is a specific kind of UDI. We already have implantable UDI in USCDI and in certification, and this was proposed to be added as another particular unique device identifier in whether or not it is useful enough and broadly applicable enough for enough scenarios that it would warrant some addition to USCDI, and including what experience health IT developers have already in using and exchanging this element. These are the specific kinds of questions we would like feedback on, and if anyone has that and can speak to experience using and exchanging this data element, we would like to hear from you. Next slide.

So, I am going to go briefly through several of the resources, and it will culminate in the Google doc that we were talking about. I hope that everybody can see this. I tried to zoom in as much as I could. So, in addition to the static PDF document for USCDI, we also published draft v.5. There is a little bit of detail about the publication of draft v.5 on this tab. It shows all of the data elements that are part of draft v.5, including existing, and then new. There is an annotation that a particular data element is new to draft v.5, and you can scroll through those to see, and just to highlight, these are the ones. It is a little hard to pick out individual ones, so the new ones are highlighted.

Seth Pazinski
Al, sorry to interrupt, but we are still seeing the slides. If we need to pivot to a webpage, give Accel a heads up.

Al Taylor
Hang on a second. Can I share my screen? Is that okay?

Seth Pazinski
Go ahead, Al. You should be able to now.

Al Taylor
Sorry about that. So, this is the first one I wanted to speak to. This is draft v.5. It shows the new data elements compared to Version 4, and you can look through this and focus on any one in particular that you have some particular comments on. It could drive discussion in the workgroup, or it could drive personal individual comments through the commenting system. So, this is one area that we would like feedback on. The other area that we are asking for specific feedback on is the Level 2 data elements, and so, on the Level 2 tab, we indicate which of the data elements were added to draft v.5, and so, they are listed in both places for now. When they become final, they will not be listed as Level 2 anymore. They will come off the Level 2 list because now they are part of an actual final version of USCDI.

So, either of these two tabs are fair game for comments, and in order to make a comment on the USCDI website, individuals have to register on the USCDI website, and then, once they're registered, they can add comments simply by clicking on "add new comment," and we are looking for as specific information as you can provide to inform a recommendation. We have a management system that allows us to capture and analyze every recommendation, including every letter that is attached to that recommendation, and then

we compile all the comments by data element and data class and make the determination based on all of that feedback. If there is a significant amount of input on a particular data element that is not in draft v.5, we will certainly give that strong consideration. If there is strong feedback on a data element in draft v.5 that should not be there, we will also take that under consideration.

So, the comment process is pretty straightforward. The deadline for comments is April 15th at midnight, so, just remember, all the HITAC recommendations are converted into separate comments for us on our back-end system. They do not show up here on the USCDI website, but they do show up on the HITAC website, as well as in our back-end comment processing system, so we consider every recommendation fully to help inform our decisions about the final version of USCDI.

The other resource that I wanted to point to is the standards bulletin. Every time we publish a version of USCDI, we publish a supporting standards bulletin. The standards bulletin is published on our HealthIt.gov website, and it describes the background for the USCDI and USCDI v.5, it shows the new data elements that we have added, and then it goes into a little bit more detail about the hows and whys of the particular data elements we added. After this description, we discussed other changes that we made. As I mentioned before, we made some changes to some data elements.

For Version 4 data elements, we changed some things, including adding an applicable standard to the encounter location, and then we made a few changes to how we reference a variety of different vocabulary standards. There were also some minor changes to a number of different data elements, so those are listed here. For those interested in what has changed, the changelog is an appendix to the standards document, and there is a link to the appendix in the standards document itself. Bear with me as we move the PDF to the right page. The changelog is in the appendix of the USCDI standards document, and it notes the changes or what data elements changed. It does not always specify the change that was made. This is another resource for you to look at, just to get an overall view of what is new to draft v.5.

The center of attention is going to be the workgroup spreadsheet, as we have done in the past. The first 13 elements on this spreadsheet are the data elements that were added to draft v.5, and that is indicated by Column I, which shows that it is either a draft v.5 data element or may have been added to… So, encounter location is a v.4 data element that we added an applicable standard for. I added this one because I think this is the most significant change to preexisting data elements, and so, it is listed here to try to elicit comments if there are any comments in support or against, however that falls out.

This column, Column J, is for individual workgroup members to insert their comments. We see here that Steven Lane has already stated his support of inclusion, and Hans asked a more detailed question related to US Core. This is the individual plain text recommendation, along with Column K, which is the justification or any detail to support it, and then, as we discuss individual data elements or individual recommendations in the workgroup, those will be recorded in Column L, and then, from all of this, you will all come up with the final recommendation, which is what will populate the recommendations letter transmittal to the national coordinator.

So, I know this has been a concern to several workgroup members. One other aspect about these data elements is how they are going to be represented in US Core and in C-CDA. As I have said before, those resources, those sections, and those entries in US Core and C-CDA have not yet been designed, and there

is no definitive mapping, if you will, to where they would land in those IGs. We have done a lot of research. We actually sit on those workgroups as those IGs are being developed, and we did that again this time with the v.4 data elements that are being written into those IGs, but whether there is an existing resource, profile, or element of something in US Core, C-CDA, or not, that is work that still needs to be done to finalize it. I had said in an earlier email that ONC would provide the products of our own internal analysis, but we are not going to do that because I think sharing our own thoughts and research may cause some confusion or concern amongst members as to whether or not our statement of our own thoughts and research on it might be misconstrued as some sort of guidance or definitive answer.

I just wanted to be clear that anybody's prediction about how this would end up in US Core or C-CDA is a little bit more than speculative, but it is essentially speculative because we do not know how the workgroups will address it or map it. We had some mapping decisions made fairly late in the game for the IGs that support Version 4, and so, anything that we or the workgroup says right now is what is or might be in US Core based on other FHIR IGs or C-CDA IGs is really just meant to inform what is felt to be the potential burden of development, and that potential developmental burden is one aspect that will inform members' recommendation as far as whether to support or oppose its addition to USCDI. But that work is being done. There have already been a lot of comments made on the FHIR IGs and the C-CDA IGs, and whether or not it ends up being difficult or burdensome to do it is something that is yet to be seen. I think this is an aspect that Hans and Ricky are working on, and probably others as well, to help populate that and help the workgroup understand what the potential burden is.

The only other aspects on this spreadsheet are, No. 1, this is a restatement of the prioritization criteria, which I think we are all familiar with. It is listed here, it is listed on the USCDI, and it is listed within the standards bulletin, so it can help members understand what sort of things were considered when the data elements were added to USCDI. And then, all of the data elements that are in v.5 are added here to show the whole scope. This is just another way of looking at the Level 2 website or the draft v.5 webpage. I think that that is all that I wanted to cover as far as resources available to the workgroup, and I can stop sharing, look at some questions, and see if I can answer any of them.

Workgroup Discussion (00:49:37)

Steven Eichner
Al, this is Steve. Thank you for the great presentation. Before we get into all the questions in the chat, I saw one pop up that would be good to address first. Remind us about whether inclusion in the USCDI means that healthcare providers have to use it and it has to be populated. Can you talk about that as a gentle reminder for folks? That is something that pops up from year to year.

Al Taylor
Sure. I think that is a question that comes up more or less constantly, and it bears repeating. Having a data element in USCDI means that, if updated to that version of USCDI, health IT has to be able to demonstrate the ability to exchange the data element using the applicable standards if they are available. It does not mean that it has to be integrated into every workflow, it does not mean that every provider has to capture it every time for every encounter, and it does not mean that that data will be available to a patient if they were to access it through View, Download, and Transmit, for example. However, if the information is available and is in a system, we would expect that health IT could exchange it using a FHIR IG, an API, or exchanging

it in a C-CDA or CDA-type document. That is the expectation, not that every provider has to capture it every time they see every patient.

Sarah DeSilvey
We have another question from Hans.

Hans Buitendijk
Thank you, Sarah. I just have a comment on the prior note, and then a question. I think this is level-setting for everybody, or for those who might not have been part of it before. While USCDI does not require every provider to manage, collect, and otherwise address the data, any HIT, not just an EHR, that wishes to be certified must support everything that is in USCDI because they certified their software using the FHIR US Core and C-CDA specifications, and that is where there is a clarifying question on process, and I made a comment in the spreadsheet as well for later on, but if you already have some thoughts around that, Al, it would be great. You described very well the transition from USCDI, the timeline to get it into FHIR, US Core, and C-CDA, and discussions that need to occur to make sure that those that participate in the definition of the standards know how to interpret it.

In the end, we get FHIR US Core and C-CDA specifications out of that that support USCDI, but what experience has taught us over the last couple years and what we see as a gap increasing over time as we get to the next version of USCDI is that because of the interpretations and decisions made, there are ambiguities in the USCDI definition and interpretations otherwise. The scope, as you can interpret it from USCDI when you put it next to the published version of USCDI and next to the published version of the standards, is not totally in sync, and what I am curious about is some of the thoughts, which may be for HITAC to address later in some recommendations as well, about how we can make sure USCDI is brought in line with or realigned with whatever comes out of FHIR US Core and C-CDA so that anybody reading either one of those comes to the same conclusion as to what data to expect from systems and providers that they reasonably can expect or look forward to having access to. What are some of the thoughts to close that gap after both are published?

Al Taylor
In answering that question, I would reframe it as how does US Core and C-CDA align with USCDI? That is the sequence of events. We publish USCDI, and then we work with HL7 to help design these resources and data elements in a way that reflects ONC's intent for adding the data element. We have done that in the past. Where the design seems to be going in a direction that does not seem to meet ONC's intent, we weigh in so how that is reflected does align with what ONC intends, and particularly for previous data elements that were already mapped to a US Core or C-CDA IG, where there is ambiguity, as you said, or some uncertainty about what is meant by a data element in USCDI, I would suggest that a comment on the ballot be made.

The outcome of that ballot should be to reflect ONC's intent in exchanging those data elements, whereas if there is a significant change in the definition to USCDI, for example, or the addition of an applicable standard, as in the case of our proposal for encounter location, we would expect the design phase for the next version of US Core to reflect that applicable standard in some way, and there are different ways that the IGs reflect applicable standards. Sometimes it is a binding to a vocabulary standard, sometimes it is a binding to a translation of a code, but it varies how they reflect that, but we work very closely to make sure

that what we think is the intent of this particular data element and why we wanted to add it in the first place is reflected in those IGs. So, it is an intentional process, and before and after we publish a draft and a final, we work very closely to make sure that happens.

Sarah DeSilvey
Thank you so much, Al. I want to hold up one thing and then get to Pooja's question. I just want us to ground ourselves in the fact that while we note that Al's presentation was very, very helpful, the intent of this meeting is to ensure that everyone walks out of this meeting understanding how to engage so that there is no knowledge gap on how to find historical information, how to add that information to the current Google doc, and how to add Level 2 elements to the bottom of the doc. I am hopefully going to field one more question from Pooja, and then I just want to take us back to that Google document that is going to be the home of our core work, and because we have about 25 minutes until we go to public comment, I really want to make sure everyone feels that they get that Google doc element before we go to public comment. Pooja?

Pooja Babbrah
Thanks, Sarah. My question is probably a little bit related to that, and I am still working through all the background stuff, but there is something I could not remember. I know USCDI+ is completely separate than USCDI, but if we think there is a data element that we end up wanting to recommend for USCDI+, is that an opportunity as well? I just do not remember from last year if we did that or not.

Al Taylor
A recommendation for adding something to USCDI+ is out of scope for the workgroup. It does not mean that, as an individual, you cannot recommend something you think a candidate. The collection of data elements that make up a package of data, say, for USCDI+ Cancer or USCDI+ Public Health, are determined by the sponsors of those groups, so, USCDI+ Cancer is our engagement with NCI, Public Health is based on our engagement primarily with CDC, but with other participants as well. So, I would say to make that recommendation by all means, but I would say to have the workgroup develop recommendations for USCDI+ is out of scope, and we just simply do not have time.

Sarah DeSilvey
I think we should go to the Google doc just one more time because if there is a place where our next work needs to happen, it is asynchronously in that Google document that we all have access to. Al, do you mind sharing that again? That would be great. There is the public process for engaging and commenting on USCDI, and then there is the process that we utilize within our workgroup. Steven was very kind, as even I put things in the wrong element. If we scroll all the way to the left, there are a few basics I want to make sure that all of us walk out of this meeting understanding. Every element has an entry number, and that is a definer that, regardless of where it moves in the spreadsheet, defines that element.

And then, there are the hyperlinks in the elements or in the data class and the data element that can take you to more information, there is ONC's definition, and again, part of what we are doing as a workgroup is commenting on possible adaptations or changes to definitions, suggestions of aligned data elements, and questions of expansion of a data element if we feel like the element itself needs additional elements in order to represent the full context. We saw this happen a lot last year with laboratory elements. And then, there is Column H, which is aligned vocabulary standards, and then you can see Column I, which is where we differentiate between it being a draft USCDI v.5 element, and then, eventually, you will see Level 2

identifiers there. Here, you can see where a lot of our work happens, so what we will be doing really is in J, K, and I for the foreseeable future. J is individual people putting their stamp on a recommendation that goes toward a final recommendation from the IS WG.

You can see that Hans, Steven, and ONC have brought forward some of those questions that matter to them. I also have some statements down below. If there is a rationale or justification, that goes in Column K, and then, there is an opportunity for discussion in Column L. We do want to note also that anything in Column L is that work/homework question. If there are specific entities that we need to bring in as guest speakers, then we would want to identify that early in Column L so that ONC and us as the co-chairs can help do the outreach on that. And then, we eventually move toward crafting a final recommendation in Column M, but J, K, and I, along with the work that Hans and Ricky are doing with aligned standards, are where what we are doing now applies.

I have one more thing. Al, would you mind scrolling down to the bottom? Starting in Rows 21 and 22, Hans has put a kind of break there with some thoughts. This is where we will add any Level 2 elements that we feel need to be elevated. I think we have that here. Al is carrying entry numbers down. So, if either a past or new IS WG member wants to resurface a Level 2 element we have discussed before, aligning with an entry number, they will put their name by it, they will reference data classes, data elements, and working definitions, and then we will have a conversation regarding that in this meeting. I just want to make sure that everyone knows that process before we leave, and then, Ike or any other IS WG members, if I have misstated anything, please let me know, but I do not want to leave this meeting without those core elements being in hand. Hans?

Hans Buitendijk
I just have a quick process question. I put in two rows there with general process. They are not specific classes, but are process-focused. Is that indeed the correct places to do it, also recognizing that the warning message does not like the word “general process”? Did I do that in the right place?

Al Taylor
I would defer to the co-chairs on that. If it is going to end up being a recommendation on general process, then this would be a place to capture that, unless the co-chairs want to capture out-of-scope issues separately.

Sarah DeSilvey
I hear that. I do not know where else we would comment on the document.

Al Taylor
Here is fine.

Sarah DeSilvey
Ike, any thoughts?

Steven Eichner
Yes. I think the only other alternative would be another tab, and that could get confusing.

Al Taylor
I agree.

Sarah DeSilvey
Yes. So, just revisiting, Hans, thank you for that question. Any other questions from any new member or past member on where we do the work and how the work gets done? We will be making recommendations on the USCDI draft v.5 elements that are entered in Row 13 and above, and if we desire to do so, we will also be adding Level 2 elements down below.

Steven Eichner
I guess the only thing I might suggest is adding a tag after "general process" like "OOS" or something of that ilk, some indicator that there is a suggestion that it might be out of scope.

Sarah DeSilvey
Okay. Mark has a question. So, we need some way to identify it that is on this sheet, but maybe not in the same column as a new data class. I bet we can figure that out, and I think we all agree that taking it to a different tab might be confusing. Thank you. I think we can figure that out between now and our next meeting.

Steven Eichner
It should be the exception rather than the rule. I am hesitant to add it as a completely separate column or indicator because then you also have to address all the standard things that are in scope.

Al Taylor
Just as a reminder for folks that are entering comments, put your name as the advocate for it in Column D.

Sarah DeSilvey
Just to reiterate what is being said in the chat, I do feel like it is great to get any Level 2 recommendations in as soon as possible, especially because they often are elements that require voices from external experts in order to elevate them and discuss them appropriately. Again, the intent of this time is to make sure that all members understand how to engage. I am sensing that the lack of questions from new members means we feel comfortable with navigating asynchronously in the Google doc and adding our comments in the appropriate columns. The good thing is there is some precedent. As we go back to Columns J and K, you can see there is precedent from early commenters and leaders who are able to see how the template might be completed. So, the task really is for us to just ensure that we review current recommendations and offer commentary to be made on them, if we have it, before our next meeting. If you have questions about the Google document itself, this would be the time to raise them. Steven has a question, and then I will take Rochelle's question.

Steven Lane
It is more of just a comment. Again, I try to set a little bit of an example. In supporting the inclusion, you do not need to add a line for anyone who wants to add their support. Just add your name, and then we can make a pile.

Sarah DeSilvey

Thank you so much. It looks like we have a couple questions in the chat. Rochelle, if you could raise your hand and ask your question, I will review the chat to make sure that every member walks out of here understanding the task. Rochelle?

Rochelle Prosser
Hi, thank you. I just wanted to clarify that as we are utilizing the document and might forget something from what you explained today, though I thank you so much for going over this, would there be an opportunity to either email one of you to say, "Is this where you want it to be?" and identifying if you just wanted to sign on? Thank you for the prior comment. That was the second question that I had. If you just want to agree with what somebody had written, do you just add your name?

Sarah DeSilvey
Yes, that is very much a precedent we have used before, like a plus one.

Rochelle Prosser
Thank you so much. So, is there anywhere we could email if we forgot to put it in? I just do not want to mess up the document.

Sarah DeSilvey
Oh, you can always reach out for guidance, and we do have versions, so I would say engage with your expertise, and we are here to assist if you want. As a new member last year, there were so many members who were helpful to me who were kind of like handmaidens as I went through this process. I am happy to do that myself, and all of us are here to make sure your expertise is brought to the work at hand.

Rochelle Prosser
Perfect. Thank you so much.

Sarah DeSilvey
It looks like I found a question here. Al, can you see that question at 10:43 a.m. on process? I do not think we have addressed that yet. It regards seeing some differences between the PowerPoint from last week and what is online. "Is what is online the source of truth, for example, SDOH note in Level 2 in PowerPoint and Level 1 online?" Al, can you assist with that one?

Al Taylor
Could I ask Katrina to point out the differences so I can address them specifically?

Katrina Miller Parrish
Sure. Do you want me to send you an email with screenshots?

Al Taylor
What was the difference? What idea was the difference?

Katrina Miller Parrish

Sure. On the PowerPoint, maternal SDOH clinical note was listed on the all-Level-2 slide, and online, I found it in Level 1, so in the idea of what may progress from Level 2, I did not know if it was under consideration or not.

Al Taylor
That might be a typo. Just send me an email. We will reconcile that. The question about leveling is a fair question, but when there is a discrepancy… So, the answer to your question is that online is the source of truth. It was translated in the slides incorrectly.

Katrina Miller Parrish
Okay, that is what I figured. Thank you.

Sarah DeSilvey
Any other questions on process, understanding that the purpose of this meeting was to ensure that everyone understood how to do the work at hand? We have about 10 minutes before public comment. We could go to public comment early if we feel like we want to reflect on process, go into the Google document, and then come into next meeting ready to maybe even move some things along. As a note, one of our historical ways of moving through draft recommendations is anything that is very clearly consensus, we try to address early in our work and just try to narrow the scope of things that might need more robust conversation, so when we come back, it might be helpful to review some of those elements, and then we have a history of color-coding them, understanding that we want to make sure we are being accessible to people with the colors that we choose, and then we can plan our conversations for some of the more complex elements. I do not want to leave this meeting without having everyone understand the process. It seems like we are good.

Again, Al has been amazing, and Al, thank you again. One thing that is very clear is that the orientation you gave would be very helpful for people beyond us insofar as making the work that happens at this committee transparent to other people in the ecosystem, so, thank you so much. Seth, Wendy, Al, or Ike, any other thoughts? Again, I think it would probably be smart to let people digest this before we actually start discussing elements next week.

Al Taylor
I just wanted to scroll through the comments, and I am sorry that I did not get a chance to review them while I was presenting, but Mark asked a question that might have already been answered about how one proposes Level 2 data elements. I think you discussed that, Sarah. Just add a Level 2 because we do not know which Level 2 data elements anyone might recommend, so just add them here, scroll over to Column I, where it says this data element came from Level 2, and then put what your recommendation is. It could be something as simple as “Add it” or “Add it why?” For member recommendation, you could call it a draft of the workgroup recommendation, like Steven stated succinctly, and then provide your justification and discussion in Column K. That did answer your question, right, Mark?

Mark Savage
Yes, thanks so much.

Al Taylor

Sure. I do not have anything else.

Sarah DeSilvey
Okay. I am going to highlight again, and it looks like Seth is ready. As co-chairs, we are trying to get you the homework early because we have an early meeting on Tuesdays, so, what we are hoping to achieve is to have your comments documented in this doc asynchronously. If there are Level 2 elements that we hope to consider within our charge, we hope to have them added with a member of reference, and again, we do want to make sure that if there are more complicated elements that we need further information on and we need external experts for that we document that as well so that ONC and the co-chairs can coordinate those guest speakers. If all of those things are in hand, Ike, is there anything further to add? It looks like we might have lost Ike, so I am going to transition back to you, Seth. I think we can go back to the slides.

Public Comment (01:16:26)

Seth Pazinski
All right, thank you, Sarah. Can we go to the public comment slide? Thank you, Accel. So, at this point, we are going to open up the meeting for public comment. If you are a member of the public on Zoom and would like to make a comment, please use the raise hand feature that is located on the Zoom toolbar at the bottom of your screen. If you are participating today by phone only, you can press *9 to raise your hand, and once called upon, press *6 to mute and unmute your line. We will just give that a few seconds to see if we have any public comments. I am not seeing any public comments, nor any hands raised, so we will conclude our public comments.

Again, as a couple of reminders based on questions we saw in the chat from earlier in the call, we will include the link to the mapping document that showed prior HITAC recommendations to USCDI v.4 and draft v.5 in the homework message, so you will have that resource listed in your email, and then, as Sarah highlighted, we will be looking to coordinate on upcoming topics, and if you have thoughts on any additional external experts to invite to present or be a part of those conversations, we welcome those thoughts as well. With that, I will turn it back to Sarah to close us out.

Sarah DeSilvey
I just want to say thank you again to ONC for helping with this really important orientation to the work. Again, we really want to make sure all your expertise is laid to bear, and I hope this orientation helped. I just want to note that based on past progress, this is probably one of the only IS WG meetings that will end early. Once we get into the actual review of the data elements, every moment is precious, so I am happy to end this meeting early once the process elements are in hand, and we look forward to kicking off the work full steam ahead next week, and again, based on the past work, it is a really in-depth, very fascinating course of work until April 11th, so we will see you next week.

Adjourn (01:19:12)

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments were received during public comment.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA ZOOM WEBINAR CHAT

Keith E. Campbell: Good morning, I joined after my name was called.

Anna McCollister: I think I missed roll call, but I'm here :-)

Steven Lane: Thank you so much, ONC staff, for performing and providing this incredibly valuable analysis.

Pooja Babbrah: I don't remember this from last year. This is very helpful!

Katrina Miller Parrish: Thanks for more clarity! Could you scroll and show all of them?

Steven Lane: This has been requested in the past, but this is the first time we are seeing it.

Steven Lane: Does this include all past work groups, or only 2023?

Grace Cordovano: This is a fantastic resource! Thanks to all who coordinated this!

Grace Cordovano: +100 Mark!

Steven Lane: +1 @Mark

Anna McCollister: Plus one to what mark said!

Grace Cordovano: What can be done better to elevate and get prioritized elements through the finish line.

Grace Cordovano: Or what is missing as to why something fell short.

Seth Pazinski: Yes, this analysis was distributed to HITAC ISWG members as an Excel spreadsheet in advance of our meeting today. We will include a link to this info as a Google Doc in the homework after our call today as well.

Sarah DeSilvey: thank you, seth!

Anna McCollister: I don't see this excel sheet in my emails. Can you resend?

Steven Lane: While ONC has been INCREDIBLY responsive to questions of how and why USCDI progresses as it does, these questions come up every year, especially as new members join the workgroup.

Keith E. Campbell: Is there significance to the first 18 rows being highlighted in green?

Hans Buitendijk: Current timeline for FHIR US Core and C-CDA that support USCDI v4 are expected to be published around May/June.

Pooja Babbrah: So latest version of US Core is 6.0.1?

Hans Buitendijk: 6.1.0

Christina Caraballo: Thanks, Hans!

Hans Buitendijk: As USCDI is applied to FHIR US Core/C-CDA a number of ambiguities are addressed and result into the actual scope of what FHIR US Core and C-CDA represent. How can we ensure that USCDI is subsequently amended to remove any variances in how the scopes of USCDI vs. the agreed to FHIR US Core/C-CDA version can be interpreted?

Grace Cordovano: I continue struggle with the "sufficient implementation across health IT developers" component. What data do I as a workgroup member have as a reference to assess that?

Grace Cordovano: To play devil's advocate, many high priority items, from the patient and carepartner perspective, are likely NOT sufficiently implemented as need a catalyst to catch up.

Grace Cordovano: *and need

Hans Buitendijk: We need to understand the difference between author vs. informant.

Pooja Babbrah: +1 grace

Katrina Miller Parrish: Are you showing a webpage?

Katrina Miller Parrish: Thanks!

Seth Pazinski: USCDI Draft v5 -- https://www.healthit.gov/isa/united-states-core-data-interoperability-uscdi#draft-uscdi-v5

Seth Pazinski: USCDI Level 2 -- https://www.healthit.gov/isa/united-states-core-data-interoperability-uscdi#level-2

Grace Cordovano: When things bump up from level 2, do we concurrently replace with at least that many elements from level 1 or comment?

Steven Lane: On the Level 2 tab it would also be helpful to see which elements have been recommended by the taskforce in prior years.

Grace Cordovano: Suggesting a way for elements and classes submitted/recommended by patients, with use cases specified, be considered for elevation. Would love to discuss with the ISWG and ONC at any time.

Steven Lane: Or perhaps recommended by HITAC in prior years.

Sarah DeSilvey: I am very grateful for this tutorial. I wished I had this last year! I hope it is helpful to new members so we can make sure we can fully leveraged your expertise during the completion of our charge.

Grace Cordovano: Agree Sarah, thank you Al. This would be a great tutorial/educational piece to link to the site.

Seth Pazinski: ONC Standards Bulletin addressing Draft USCDI v5 -- https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/page/2024-01/Standards_Bulletin_2024-1.pdf

Sarah DeSilvey: +1 Grace!

Katrina Miller Parrish: I see some differences in the powerpoint from last week and online. Is online source of truth? EG, Maternal SDOH note Lvl 2 in ppt and Lvl 1 online.

Anna McCollister: Agreed with Sarah and grace. This is a very good orientation.

Steven Lane: In fairness, Al has given similar overview/introductory/explanatory presentations to the WG each of the past few years. Suggest that this presentation be recorded each year and posted for public access.

Hung S. Luu: Can we stress that inclusion in the USCDI does not mean the data element must be collected by providers or hospitals. It only means certified HIT must demonstrate (eventually) that they can support the data element? This seems to come up each year and is a common misconception.

Seth Pazinski: Change Log from USCDI v4 to Draft USCDI v5 starts on page 43 -- https://www.healthit.gov/isa/sites/isa/files/2024-01/Draft-USCDI-Version-5-January-2024-Final.pdf

Sarah DeSilvey: thank you steven!

Mark Savage: Thank you, Al!

Grace Cordovano: +100 Steven! Thanks to you both, Hans and Ricky

Mark Savage: Yes, thanks so much Hans and Ricky!

Hung S. Luu: Agreed. Thank you Hans and Riki!

Ann Phillips: Thank you, Hans!

Ricky Bloomfield: You're welcome, my pleasure. We welcome input from other workgroup members as well! Unfortunately I have to drop early today but I'm looking forward to continued progress on this with the group!

Sarah DeSilvey: thank you, Ricky!

Steven Lane: We have heard that this workgroup MAY be asked to weigh in on a segment of USCDI+ later this year, after we have completed our work on USCDI v5.

Mark Savage: I'm not clear on when and how we propose Level 2 elements for consideration. The worksheets I've reviewed seem focused on draft v5. Do WG members begin recommending now Level 2 items for consideration, which we get to at the appropriate time?

Pooja Babbrah: Thanks, Steven

Pooja Babbrah: Mark - I think that is how we did it last year. We started adding Level 2 and got to them later in our work

Steven Lane: Yes, @Mark, typically the WG discusses the elements proposed by ONC for the new version followed by Level 2 items that we want to propose adding. No harm in starting on the recommendations regarding Level 2 elements now, anticipating that they will be discussed in a few weeks.

Mark Savage: Create a new column for listing more general items, so not listed as data elements?

Hans Buitendijk: Last years an update/considerations by HL7 team lead on process and helpful guidance/focus to get to FHIR US Core/C-CDA has been helpful, particularly when not as familiar with that and get a sense of effort.

Rochelle Prosser: We can ask questions later?

Rochelle Prosser: About that Google document?

Mark Savage: Al is our process and institutional memory!

Katrina Miller Parrish: Thank you all so much for taking time to make sure those of us who are new understand the background and process for task at hand. Appreciate it.

Rochelle Prosser: Thank you

Shelly Spiro: Thank you Al for the great presentation.

Pooja Babbrah: thank you all!

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

No comments were received via email.

RESOURCES

IS WG Webpage
IS WG - January 30, 2024, Meeting Webpage

Transcript approved by Wendy Noboa, HITAC DFO on 2/7/2024.