

**NwHIN Power Team  
Draft Transcript  
August 23, 2011**

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Thank you operator. Good afternoon everybody and welcome to the Standards Committee's NwHIN Power team call. This is a federal advisory call so there will be opportunity at the end of the call for the public to make comment. Let me do a quick roll call. Dixie Baker?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

I'm here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Wes Rishel?

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Incorporated**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Cris Ross.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

I'm here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Tim Cromwell? John Feikema?

**John Feikema – VisionShare - President**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Kevin Hutchinson? Ken Tarkoff?

**Ken Tarkoff**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Brian Adams?

**Brian Adams**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Nancy Orvis? David McCallie?

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Ollie Gray?

**Ollie Gray**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Avinash?

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Here.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Mary Jo Deering. And did I leave anybody off? All right I'll turn it over to Dixie.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. First of all I apologize for dialing late, it wasn't on my calendar for some reason, but we're all here now and so to begin with we want to review the, now is on the Webinar? I don't see it. Okay. I'll look at the agenda. The first thing on our agenda is the update from the Standards Committee last week. Last week we did present our results to date. We presented the process. We presented the scores that have been assigned specifically for the exchange specifications and the two specifications that comprise direct. And we presented our preliminary results. So we'll go over that today. So we'll, the next point is the final review of those scores that have been assigned to date. And the third topic is a review of these three categories, you know, of drop, adopt, and consider alternatives, and then finally we'll begin possibly, we may have to postpone this to the next meeting, a discussion of alternatives and GAPS. So, with that, do we have the slides from that were assigned, presented at the NwHIN?

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Yeah, from the Standards Committee. I had sent that out to everybody.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. So this we're seeing now, I guess I have, yep, good, good. These are the slides that were presented to the Standards Committee last week and I started off by reminding them of the tasks and these are the specifications. I know that just from comments I have received from some people it wasn't, in fact even with me, it wasn't clear to me which specifications we were looking at. But, the scores assigned were based on the specifications that have been developed specifically for NwHIN exchange and for the direct project and you'll see on your screen the URLs to the 2 sites that have all of these specifications, you can download them from there. They also exist NwHIN connect\_specifications that were based on these, but those are slightly different. The ones we're looking at are the exchange specifications themselves. The direct project comprises 2 specifications. The core transport specification, which is basically **SMPP plus SMIME** is called applicability statement for secure health transport. And then there is an implementation guide, kind of for the ramp up, ramp down kind of thing to support the interface between a direct entity and an entity that uses the exchange SOAP based for transport and that is called XDR and XDM for direct messaging. XDM is basically an IHE profile for a zip file basically, zip file that contains a document. And XDR is a SOAP based transport that is compatible

with exchange. So, I led them through the process, you know, looking at first at the elimination task, looking at if there are specifications that really no one wants, we eliminate them. Secondly, is to identify the specifications that are early or moderate stages of development, the specification itself. And they use technologies that are in the declining stage of the lifecycle. Basically, we're saying here that, you know, if you're still working on the spec and it uses technologies that are, you know, going out of favor in the industry then why continue to use those, maybe we consider alternatives for these specifications instead, you know, technologies that are more in the emerging maturity, maturing or mature phases of the lifecycle. So the third, is to evaluate the remaining spec. So, back on this one. We don't eliminate these but we put them on a pile for considering alternatives. The third phase is evaluate the remaining specs based on their deployment and operational complexity and that is, you know, how hard is it to implement and how hard is it to maintain over time, and industry adoption where industry is relative to the industry the specification is really targeting. And then we recommended building blocks to specs that fall into this area. And we recommend alternatives to specs that fall into this area, you know, highly complex, not broadly adopted. And then we consider on a case by case any specs, case by case basis any specs that lie in these other areas. So, we, just to clarify the ONC team that is supporting us has defined deployment operational complexity using low, medium, and high. Low is that it can be deployed and maintained basically fairly easily by IT support. Moderate is it needs a modest administrative support for both implementation and maintenance over time. And then finally, the high is there is a substantial ongoing IT investment to support the service. Just a minute. Industry adoption as I mentioned is assessed relative to the market segment that the spec was developed for. In other words, if it's a, if it uses technology standards that are used across all of, everybody uses, like SOAP for example, then the industry adoption is based on how broadly....If on the other hand it is using a technology that is just, the spec is specifically geared to health market then the industry adoption judged relative to the health market. Am I still on line? Hello.

W

Yes.

M

Yep.

M

Yes.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

I keep getting these calls and I'm thinking maybe I'm not on line anymore. Okay. The next step is to consider alternatives and the 2 sources that we have identified so far are the NwHIN power sub team that Ken Tarkoff led that looked at specifications that have been broadly adopted by health care. And then the second source is other industry standards that are out there that could be brought to bare in developing a new specification we're alternative is needed. And then, as we look at alternatives we should use the same criteria that we used to evaluate the existing specs. And then the final step is just a subjective assessment of whether there are any gaps that we really should include in this suite of building blocks that will comprise the Nationwide Health Information Network. So this first slide shows the secure transport specs. Initially, you'll recall that we had divided, we had a category called security specs and another one called transport, but we combined them so these are the secure transport specs. And these are the scores that were assigned to date. And I'd like to just as we walk through these to get you get your comments on these scores assigned. I know I've already heard from David that XDR/XDM

maybe, we may want to split them because XDM is really not transport it's really a content spec and XDR is really very similar to the SOAP up here. David, would you like to articulate that better than I did?

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. Well I'm not sure I'll do it any better, but, yeah, that was you captured it. If the exchange messaging platform, the top row, is representing the XDR transaction then that seems to be covered there. And XDM is a content standard that can be used by direct through the gateway and that would be covered in our content movement. So I was just puzzled as to what was different about that 4<sup>th</sup> row from the 1<sup>st</sup> row, but that's, I'm not sure that it matters, but that was my question. You know, is the 4<sup>th</sup> row really specifically referring to the gateway specification for use of XDM on top of direct and if so, maybe we just need to change it to gateway or something.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well what the 4<sup>th</sup> row refers to is the document that is on the direct project website and it combines, that specification does combine XDR and XDM.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah, but it's through a gateway not, I mean the XDR isn't the transport, it's just a remapping at the edge as I understand it. The backbone is still SMTP I think.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

So I think the question of whether XDM should be put in this content exchange area, I would agree, it should. I think the second question is should we consider recommending a specification, the XDM specification as a building block rather than the XDR/XDM specification that currently exist in direct. Because, there is also the IT XDM specification itself.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Well those maybe separate questions and you know the answer maybe yes to both of them. I mean, I understand, maybe if I think of this 4<sup>th</sup> row as the gateway spec then it makes sense to be kept extent under the assumption that, you know, vendors who wish to have their XDR/XDM transactions transparently carried over direct with leverage, that particular building block.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

That's exactly what it is. Exactly what's on the specification that is on the direct project website that's what that row is.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

So I think maybe we just need to, maybe put the word gateway in there or something just to clarify that it is really leveraging the SMTP transport, it's just a gateway service. And yet, I would not call the maturity high necessarily because I think it only exists, that particular gateway code just exists as pilot code. I mean it's built on top of 2 relatively mature building blocks. So like several of these we have the confusion of are we rating the building block, I mean the inner block or the particular assembly. So direct, you know, is leveraging widely used SMTP but it's doing it in a slightly different way. So does that make it something different or is just more SMTP?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well we're really scoring the specifications as they stand today.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. Well then I don't know that any of these would get a mature score would they?

**W**

Well.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

I mean, you know, how many people are using XDR to move messages around? How many people are using direct to move messages around in the real world? It's still pretty small.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well that's industry adoption on the right-hand side. The spec maturity is, you know, is it still being revised and reviewed and updated.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

You know, is it or not, I don't know.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Well that's a pretty subtle staple. I agree.

**M**

Dixie, I have a question about that. Yeah, when we evaluate software products for my company we don't think it's mature until it has been implemented 30 times. You know, or major new releases of software products and that's because you can spec all you want but it actually comes out in implementation whether the specs are right. Now I'm not proposing a similar thing here, but I'm wondering are people interpreting specs maturity in the sense that you just described it or are they interpreting it in a sense of well it's a seasoned spec. It's, the 3<sup>rd</sup> revision is stable or after implementation or something like, I'm just kind of trying to ask that question.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

I think that maybe I, you know, I'm sure I didn't state exactly what you said, is it a seasoned spec, is it mature, or are they just, is it just out for, what is HL7 Standard called out for...

**M**

Yeah. Trial use.

**M**

Trial use.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Use. Yeah. Yeah. If it's out for trial use then I don't think, this is me, I don't think it's mature. If it's a final spec then it's mature.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

I agree with one exception that the processes of various organizations can allow something to go from trial use to final specification without there ever having been any trial use. So, I think that, you know, an evaluation approach should look at it having been used with live data and there having been a chance to respond to the lessons learned in that process.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Avinash you're on the line aren't you?

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Yeah. I'm on the line.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. How did you guys interpret spec maturity?

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

So, I think it's a combination of the discussions and to be fair, yes, it is a pretty technical thing, so you know where we have to phase in which we tried to differentiate was to also put in this technology maturity column to kind of distinguish where, you know, if a spec is, as you said, mature enough in the sense it's not going through several changes and is stable, and at the same time we also have the ability to understand whether this has been implemented widely or not. So, in memory that was.... Where maturity of a spec we kind of considered more in terms of whether the spec has been stable as it is undergoing several revisions, has it gone through several motions and has been used, and then capturing some of the usage of it in products and software implementations in the technology maturity column. So, it was a balance.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well the use of it is in industry adoption. The technology maturity is really, or should be, you know, whether it uses a technology that is, you know, kind of no longer being used or if it's an emerging technology. You know, the adoption is really in that column.

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Yes, I meant industry option, sorry.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Oh, okay, yes. So, I would question going back to spec maturity the direct secure transport, relative to this conversation, they are, if I understand some e-mail that I've seen go by in the last couple of weeks, they're currently considering revising the whole DNS and allowing an LDAP kind of secondary check for the certificate. So, is that still going on? Because, certainly, you know, if they're still considering other ways of getting the certificate I wouldn't call the spec mature.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. This is David. I mean, that's certainly being discussed. There are a number of people who have been begging for that extension, it's not necessarily clear what the real demand is, but certainly a vocal demand. The changes would be additive, in other words, it would be an optional additional way to resolve an address. So the core spec doesn't change. It's a...

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

A plug-in if you would. But, I agree it's not, you know, it would be a change in the sense that people who have adopted the code would probably want to add these new capabilities once they get proven. The current process is for somebody to implement a reference implementation and to go test it in a pilot setting before it gets merged into the official code release.

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Incorporated**

Sorry, is this about an .... To change DNS or is this about.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

No, no, no Wes. I'll, one sentence summary is an addition to the look-up protocol that say's if you can't find it as a cert record in DNS then see if there is an SRV record in DNS that points to an LDAP service and it that's...

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Incorporated**

Oh right, yeah. Okay.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Go find it in LDAP.

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Incorporated**

All right. So this is a direct thing?

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah, and I, in that e-mail exchange, I suggested that I would like to see it as a separate implementation just like XDR/XDM, and everybody on that exchange, most of them I didn't know, except for you guys, said "no we wanted this as a change to the core spec." So, I'm asking do you think, and you too, and Cris Ross if he is on line, and John Feikema as well, should the direct secures transport be judged high in spec maturity?

**John Feikema, VisionShare - President**

This is John Feikema. I, you know, my personal bias says that it should be we're from our perspective it's in production, we're out there running with it, any changes or as David put it, additions to the spec would be ones that could be added onto it and wouldn't force us to start over. It would just augment how it works going forward. So, just makes some sense.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

You know, Dixie, in some ways the direct spec is almost more of a profile on how to use two very mature specs, SMTP and **SMIME**.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. Yes.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

You know, I mean to the degree that the essence of it is very mature, but all these little glue details, which are really more like a profile are still perhaps in maybe some flux, but not in a, the flux is backwards compatible so it won't break anything that is already deployed.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yes. So basically

**M**

Sorry go ahead Dixie.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

No, no, no. I thought they were finished. Go ahead.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

This is Cris Ross. So I would agree with David and John that based on that description the spec maturity would be high. I guess the question is whether if you judge spec maturity to be does every industry participant have exactly the same view on how to implement it in a consistent fashion? I think it would be hard to say that anything that had been developed by consensus over the last, you know, 12-16 months could be listed as high spec maturity. So, it depends on what we mean by spec maturity, but given the context of this conversation of course it belongs high. I guess the place where I've got questions is around XDR and XDM in two ways. One is XDR and XDM for direct messaging. I probably have more trouble with that. If we're really talking about that as XDR and XDM being carried by direct having that be listed as a high spec maturity. If we were talking about XDR and XDM themselves I think for sure you could list them as high spec maturity, but I'm not so positive about XDR, XDM as transported by direct, which is what I think is intended in the phrase.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yes.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

XDR and XDM for direct messaging. So, I would make the argument leave direct secure transport where it is, but if we really are, you know, moving things around, I would lower XDR and XDM for direct messaging lower in the spec maturity. There is only a very limited number of players who are implementing that. I don't think it comes anywhere close to the kind of, you know, 30 uses that, you know, bench mark that Wes laid out and so on. But, I also would say, I lost it in one of these versions I guess, why haven't we listed XDR and XDM separately not as part of direct or not as documents.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

It's a separate document if you look, if you follow this, it's a separate document under the direct project, the direct project comprises 2 specs, one is the core SMTP/**SMIME** and the other spec that exists on the direct project is called this, XDR and XDM for direct assist.

**M**

No.

**M**

He's asking a different question.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

I'm perfectly aware of that. My question is why didn't we rank XDR and XDM separately not within the context of direct?

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Why doesn't it have its own row in the spreadsheet?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

It does have its own row.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

No XDR/XDM not using direct just over sew.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Because that doesn't exist as a spec.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Ah, yeah I think it does.

**M**

Sure it does, yep.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

It's an **IAG** spec. I thought it's what you meant by SOAP messaging frankly, but maybe I'm thinking.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

No. All were looking at are the, the, is, going back to this, we are looking at these documents that's what we're looking at. And if you look at the direct project there are two documents. There is no document called XDR and XDM. We're looking at that exchange spec, the direct spec, which are these, and that's all.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

So what's included in NwHIN\_messaging platform, is that just the low level SOAP or does that refer to the XDR?

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

This is Avinash. Yeah, it's just a low level SOAP basically the.... Basic profile SOAP 1.2.... those kinds of stuff.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

So Avinash where is XDR in that list of specifications?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

There is no exchange spec called XDR.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah there is it uses the document submission standard over SOAP to directly push a document from point A to point B.

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

So this is Avinash. Yes the document submission specification is the one that is currently being used as the XDR profile, but as Dixie pointed out, there isn't in the exchange, the XDR spec is not called out as it's own spec, it's used in document submission.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

And we have put document submission spec under content exchange so we haven't gotten to that slide yet. So we're not considering every IAG document we're just considering the exchange specs and the direct specs that's it.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

So, this is Cris again. So I guess my question and Dixie, I'm going back to the presentation that was used for Standards Committee in the draft version that I've got slide 13 and 14 where we laid that out. If that's the case then I wonder where we ought to put the NwHIN components and at what granular level in this grid because as it is I think what this is displaying then, now that I'm following this, is mostly direct specs plus some other more or less generic kinds of specs like web service registry.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

But, what is in the grid are exactly these scores that I'm showing you. So the grid is not done separately it's just taking these scores and slapping them into the grid. So, if looking at the grid, you think any of these is at the wrong spot, then we should change their score.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

I think what I'm arguing for, and David you can probably improve my comment, again, is we ought to include XDR/XDM/XDSB I think somewhere under these secure transport specs.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

They're just

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Unless I'm misunderstanding the definition of transport spec versus other related specs.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

That's not a direct spec or an exchange spec. If we want to consider that as an alternative then we should put it down as an alternative, but we can't add, you know, all we're doing is scoring the specs that currently exist.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

But XDSB is the core of exchange.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Right.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

But there is no spec called that, that's what this is, exchange messaging platform, that's what that is. That's what that is. We've already captured it here.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

No, Avinash just said that was low level SOAP spec.

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

I think.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

... to be

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

There's a mismatch between what that first row means. Avinash didn't you just say it was low level SOAP only?

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Yes. Yeah, it is SOAP and WBS star and the like. The XDSB site that is being referred is, I don't see it anywhere in the exchange current set of specifications. Now, again, as secure information, I think that needs to be considered. I think that is, you know, that could be fine, but the ones that are displayed on the grid are only exchange and currently, if I look, if you at the list of specifications I think we use, you know, XTPD the patient....and all, but I don't see any of those which are in the exchange currently using XDSB.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

I see. So you're...

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Well that.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

So you're counting on XCA to be the definition for exchange of information?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well XDS is in, XDS is in exchange document submission and it's in exchange retrieve.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Right.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

So, I think regardless of what our...

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

And it's query. All three of those that's where it is, all three of those that's where it is.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

So where would those be then Dixie, I'm going...

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Come here, I'll show you. We categorized the, well discovery, has query, okay. So query is there and content exchange has document submission and retrieve.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Okay. So then I see them in the grid. I don't see them in the graphics.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well I'm showing it on the screen. Are you looking at the screen?

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Yeah I am. What I'm saying is not the grid, but the graphic, the...

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

The...

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

The, the...

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

I'll show you. Okay, let's see. Document submission is here. Query is here and retrieve is there.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

All right. So query, retrieve and document submission here specifically are referring to the flavors as implemented in NWHIN exchange.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Exactly. We're not considering anything that is not in the NWHIN exchange spec set and the direct spec set.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

So, at least for me, I took those to be more generic comments and not specifically the implementations as from NWHIN. I maybe the only one who doesn't, who had that lack of clarity, but, you know, we're showing things like XDR and XDM for direct messaging, which is a pretty low level granular comment and which gives some specificity and clarity by having document submission as an overall category. I would just worry, Dixie, that would abstract away the details.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

It's not a category. It's this list of documents. It's a document. It's a document. These are the specifications. If you go to this site you'll see each of these is a document. So when you see retrieve documents it's talking about that specification not an IT profile, that exchange specification.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Okay. I'm just saying that I've been trying to follow this pretty closely and I lost that, Dixie, I just didn't see that detail. I understand what you're saying and the argument makes sense. I think it needs to be documented more clearly so we can cross walk it back to the NWHIN exchange specifications.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

See that's why I added this chart so that you could see that these are specific specifications, specific documents. So what you're saying is maybe that, maybe where we lost it in the translation is that those complete titles don't appear to here, huh?

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Something like that yep.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

And it's not clear, I mean those documents are not layered the way we've layered these slides. So you've got a slide that talks about transport and the documents, all of them, talk a little bit about transport. Right? I mean...

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well maybe we don't need the categories, maybe we just need to look at say all of the exchange specifications. These specifications in a chart and these specifications in a chart.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

And the problem is, you know, it's right to think about the different layers if you're coming at it from an architectural assessment you want to evaluate the different layers, but we're not given that luxury. I mean, we're given this, you know, we're kind of told what the answer is and I don't quite understand what we're doing really. I mean if the answer is rate these documents, these specs on a grid, we could do that, but the specs themselves are made up of layers some of which are stronger than others, so we could rate the layers on the grid. I mean, we could say, you know, SMTP, we could rate that somewhere.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

But that's not, we're just looking at these existing specs, that's all. These documents.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

And what do they want us to tell them about those specs that really matters, what's the question that we really...

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. That's actually a good question. What they want us to tell them is should the ONC adopt this specification as it currently stands without any changes and put it, make it a building block for, make it a NwHIN spec. Because, right now it is an NHIN spec. Should we now make it a NwHIN or should we make some modifications to it, or should we recommend replacing it?

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

And I think that's an under specified question because the used cases to which they must be measured against are not specified. Maybe I think we all assume we know what that means, but you know some of these specs work beautifully in an enterprise setting under tight control, but they don't scale very well to national.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

These aren't talking about within an enterprise at all. We're talking about exchanges between entities, between organizations, the NHI. We're not looking at within an organization at all. We're just looking at the exchange of health, clinical information between organizations.

**M**

Dixie, I guess the question I'm having is not being clear what are the implications of saying it becomes an NwHIN specification, does that mean that it is required for all HIEs that get federal funding, does that mean it's required, it's use is required to achieve Meaningful Use or it's the capability to do it is required for certification of EHRs or are we talking about certifying the HIEs here? I just, you know, it's a little bit, you know it's a little bit like playing golf when you don't want to give your score until the other guy says what his score is.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well, actually we talked about that at the meeting last week, right at the end of the meeting when the same question was asked and I quoted Doug Fridsma from the previous meeting where he said that the outcome of this power team will be used to inform the ONCs decisions on whether they should fund additional pilots or, and they used the term pilot to refer to exchange and direct and those kinds of things, or whether they should invest in the development of new specifications. And then, Avinash further expanded on that and said, Avinash, is he still on the line?

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Yes. I'm on line. Oh, was that a cue for me to fill in? Yes.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yes.

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Yes. I think, and the third thing would be if there are, you know, what we think is if there are some standards within our, you know, our trial implementation pilot activity those are ready for national usage or....basis. So, in the case of direct compete....base architecture and for exchange would be the full base architecture, then ONC would certainly like to note that....then become part of any potential places where ONC could inform and require for either to certification of other governance activities. So, I think there are 3 levels that are indicative of pilot or things that are not yet matured but things that need to be kind of like GAP, then there will be areas where the specification needs to be kind of brought into maturity and then finally specifications that are ready for national usage based on their use basis.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

You know we called it at last week's meeting, John Halamka said "oh these" you know "what comes out of this power team meeting will become certification criteria" and we clarified that well there is, as Avinash used the word, roadmap. You know, these are the first steps toward that, but it's, you know, you don't expect it to make this a certification....

**Ken Tarkoff**

Dixie, this is Ken. Do they mean certification for whom, as Wes was asking for EHRs, for HIEs, or what?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

EHRs. And he was clarifying that that is not the intent at this point. This is a roadmap towards exchange between organizations and looking at existing specs to see how ready they are for prime time. That's what I keep getting from ONC or that's my wording of the message I'm getting.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

So what was the outcome? This is David and maybe I'm going to ask a dangerous question here but what was the outcome of all the pilot work and study that were done on the actual testing of these protocols, because that would seem to have more value than what we would bring to the table.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

That was one of the sources that Avinash uses, his team used to assign these scores. Avinash, why don't you talk a bit about that NHIN oversight that's not exactly what it was, you know.

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Sure, sure. Thank you. So, obviously what we, you know, what we said as a starting point, and that's where some of these scores come about, is, as we had, as part of our review, had a survey done of the existing exchange with the partners who are currently exchange and we asked them to rate these specifications on different levels of maturity and visibility. So, we got that input. We added to that some of our experiences based on operating the exchange and also on a direct side looking at direct and its pilot. So, all of those inputs were part of this grid that we, WebEx is presenting. And the idea here is that on one hand it is perfectly reasonable that, you know, if all the specifications that have gone through our, you know,....be useful and use it for use by use cases, but if some of them are clearly elements that this group feels is useful, not just for the specific trial implementations, but are ready for prime time as in the use cases have been very well vetted, specifications are mature, there is an industry adoption and an implementations have proven it, that would then become the template for any future architectures that are built with use cases, with similar ones. So essentially, all those elements of trial implementation and experiences are pulled together, but again, that's just one slice of it. I think what you also received in today's packet was an analysis by a group of SMEs who had worked on the specifications for a long time, and I think some of that inputs on specifications are also fairly relevant, I think in terms of understanding the thread and maturity of the specifications. So the hope is, from ONCs perspective, is to get all this input to identify if there are any specifications that really can be used as building block and can be published and can be brought together as recipes for building of the Nationwide Health Information Network. Does that help?

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yes. This is David. And that helps. I guess my concern is the question of whether something works in limited pilot use, particularly in a controlled pilot like the exchange pilot was where it's, you know, a very top down pilot or in a connect-a-thon, does not necessarily that it will scale in a synchronically deployed model like you had run into, you know, across the country where everybody's at a different place, doing different things, and has adopted different parts of the stack. So I'm a little nervous about extrapolating from the experience in a control pilot to the broad pilot, I mean to the broad country. I mean, I'm not sure what to do about that, but I register that as something that makes me nervous and we've had numerous off line discussions about difference between enterprise scale and you know national scale or whatever you want to call it. I'm also concerned that there is fundamental assumptions in the architecture of the exchange that aren't capture in these building blocks per se, but which may not scale either, even though the building blocks might be more or less the same. So, for example patient discovery, when there is no known place where you can go find out about patients you have to know where to look to find out about patients. You have to have oids cashed away to know to where to go look. I'm not sure that's a very scalable model. There are many things that were brought up for example in the PCAST report which aren't captured in these specifications and some of which are a part of the proposed rule making on Medi-Data that aren't captured in these specifications. So I'm not quite sure what it means to endorse these as being ready for nationwide exchange. And I sound like I'm complaining, and I'm just basically frustrated because I don't know that we can go that far based on

simply saying these are mature or not mature standards. There is so much more that needs to be settled before you scale to that level.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well I think that we can capture that. Two points I want to make here. Number one, we can certainly capture that as an explicit concern of this power team, but we also can capture it in the industry adoption. I mean, if looking at the pilot we're still nervous about scalability to a national scale then we certainly shouldn't make it moderate to high industry adoption.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Why is that?

**Ken Tarkoff**

Yeah. Dixie, this is Ken. I agree with that. And I was waiting until we got to the industry adoption side because I think, particularly at the industry defined, if we're going, and David I liked the way you articulated that, going from the pilots to the larger national scope is a big jump and on the industry adoption side I think all of these fall in the low category. And I think we have to be careful about even calling anything moderate considering something that would moderate would be that is ready for prime time, would have to be already happening to a pretty good scale, maybe in a couple of states or a couple of large regions. I don't think any of these fall under that yet.

**M**

Yeah. I think

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

I would agree with you. I don't think any pilot of anything is a moderate of high adoption.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. This is David. I agree. Well said. And thank you for helping me out there.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

That's always...

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

This is Avinash, can I make one comment on that?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah.

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Just kind of as a background, you know, on the exchange, at least though, you know, it started off as a trial implementation, I think it is my understanding that they are now running in productions for the last year or so and in terms of scalability, I agree the industry adoption was a column we tried to capture and I really, it's my understanding that many of the challenges, initial trial challenges for things such as patient discovery and SOAP web services have been mitigated by the latest activity. Again, I know DoD and VA are represented on this power team, but this was kind of the input we received from when we polled our exchange partners, but definitely DoD and VA on the power team could provide additional guidance. I just wanted to put that out.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

So is Ollie on the line? Okay, he's our, he and Nancy are our DoD people. My personal view is I agree with Ken and David on this. I think. I don't think any of these pilots could be rated moderate or high industry adoption, that they're low. But...

**M**

So this...

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

This is where we get into a little bit of trouble because some of these specifications are using, you know, as their core technology, well adopted services like SMTP, but direct per se is not widely adopted, there is no two ways about it you know, it's just not, it's just starting and same I think with most of these other ones. They are pockets where there are, I mean they may be based on widespread technology like so, but there only pockets are where people are using them as formal health care exchange specs.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

But if we are, since at this point, and David I have a second comment to your last, at this point we're looking at the exchange specification and direct specifications. We are not looking at the specifications of the underlying standards. So, I think you guys are right on that one. I wanted to make a comment, you said a while ago, David, you mentioned the PCAST. Those PCAST things are, you know, remember right now we are evaluating these exchange specs and direct specs. But the PCAST I'd certainly, myself, have identified some of the, like the PCAST Medi-Data as an alternative like to the, I think it's called the access, one of the direct, the exchange specification, the access, exchange access consent policy. The Medi-Data power team recommended, that came right out of PCAST, that certainly is an alternative. So, I think the PCAST concepts come in as alternative recommendations, you know, next, once we start to consider alternatives.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

So this is Cris. And I need to unfortunately leave this meeting at the top of the hour here, but the comments that are being made I completely agree around the level of maturity. I also think that regardless of how this has been framed up for us the best job we could possibly do is to pull these pieces apart so they make sense. I personally have no problem with pulling out and saying well here's the underlying technology that is behind this stuff where that is relevant. If we are pulling out sort of SOAP and REST and you know internet protocol who cares. We understand where they are at. But, where it is relevant, if we pull out the underlying spec and then talk about it's maturity and where it is in terms of it's lifecycle I think that's important. And then second is the specific implementations that are associated with NHIN exchange and with direct, where do those stand in terms of application of those technologies. I know it will make things more complicated, but I think it is good. The second piece is I tried to raise the issue earlier and I still think it is relevant here. I don't think we have a great cross-walk, Dixie, yet. I still don't believe from that initial slide that lists all of the NHIN exchange categories and the direct categories, I don't think that follows cleanly through the grid and into the graphic, particularly I think we lose it in the graphic, at least I do. And I would love to see that clarified more so that someone who has not been in these meetings could pick it up raw, read it and understand, you know, how it cross walks.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. I have made myself a note. We need to use exactly, exactly the same title for the spec all the way through because we've you know translated it here, you know, condensed, and I agree, I agree we lose

it there. Now, the technology maturity, your comment about the pull apart, the technology maturity really is intended to get down to the maturity of the underlying SOAP for example. Have we not adequately. I mean that's where we tried to capture that was looking at SOAP, yeah that's mature, right?

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Yeah.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Looking at, this is SAML that is mature, you know...

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Oh, so it's I think David said it the best. I mean, in my view, you know SMTP and SMIME are extremely mature and well understood and XDR, XDM in the context of IHE are about as mature as you're going to get in the IG stack for example and it's probably met the 30 implementations or more test that Wes put, but when you say XDR, XDM as transported over as SMTP, as specified by direct, you know, that's pre-pilot at this point. That's just sort of people doing some engineering work.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well that's Steve, SME says you should change this XDR, XDM to mature and we should change these to low, industry adoption to low.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

Yes. I agree with that.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. That's what we'll do.

**Cristopher Ross – Minute Clinic**

And I apologize. I need to sign off. Thanks.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. So, to repeat what I just said. What I'm hearing from all of you is that the technology maturity, maturity is the underlying technologies, all of these should be mature and industry adoption, all of these should be low? Anybody? Okay.

**M**

Agreed.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. All right. We have consensus. Okay the next one is, and if you like, we can get rid of these categories they seem to be confusing as well, and we can just do here we are ranking the, you know we are scoring the exchange specs, here we are scoring the direct specs. And I think that would get rid of the confusion as well or help get rid of the confusion of some of the comments. And it is not real clear where they belong anyway. So that is what we'll do. These are what we've called discovery specs, they are all three exchange specs. The first exchange spec is their web service registry. The second is patient discovery. The third is patient is exchange is query. And as Avinash has pointed out discovery, query, and retrieve are almost always used together so I for one, think that we should consider the three of

those together as a package and not separately. But, at any rate, looking at the rates here, the scores here, comments? Anyone? The same holds true with industry adoption.

**Ken Tarkoff**

Yeah. Dixie this is Ken. I was going to say I think industry adoption for sure needs to go to low.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

This is David. I was on mute. Yeah. I agree with that. So the web exchange patient discovery, what is exchange query, is that the XDS, that is XCA basically.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. You know, that kind of, your question, that's why I put that column in my spreadsheet that I sent to you guys that identifies the standards under it, because I agree with you, you can't really, unless you understand what's underneath, so you're looking at query?

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. That's

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Query has XDS, XCA, ....query and EBXML.

**M**

Yikes.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. If you look at, I personally think that's why the spreadsheet works a little better than this because you, because it's important that we understand what the underlying standards are.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Oh I would think on those that the deployment operational complexity has got to be rated high. I mean those things require a tremendous amount of pre-coordination before you can deploy that's why they basically work in connect-a-thons. I mean, you know, unlike, you know, a web browser where, you know, you support HTTP you can query it. These things require a lot of pre-coordination not only knowing where to look in the first place, but knowing, you know, what all the code sets are and I mean I think that has been one barriers for XDS. I mean it works in settings where you can in fact in a given infinity domain settle all that stuff, but it's hard to scale it outside that. XCA was amended to make that easier to do, but it still requires a fair amount of pre-coordination. So, I just think that deployment complexity is pretty high. I would say on all of these really.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Oh, that's what I was just going to ask you.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

But, you know I'm not an expert.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

....

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

I'm relying on what I hear from people so speak up some of you that have actually deployed these systems.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well the service...

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

This is Avinash I've been, again I think, you know, based on what we got from our exchange partners DoD, VA, Social Security Administration....partners and our experience with operations it seemed like moderate. It seems like it is not, all the kinks have been ironed out and it is, you know, we felt at least the input we got was it was not too high. So that was the insight we got with rate review.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

It took years to get it to work in that group and that's a top down group. You think that it will scale across hundreds of desynchronized states and regions.

**Ken Tarkoff**

Yeah. I think that's the good point on the complexity too. This is Ken. I think that the complexity is definitely high. I think when you have 2 groups that can get to an agreement and to that point of whether its uncontrolled and different levels of development it is definitely complex and I think that is also why direct was created to try to provide something that was simpler.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well. And if you look at patient discovery you know it is XCPD right? So we know that that is really complex.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. I mean that's a great spec with an amazing number of variations as to how it can be deployed.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

So do you think all three of these are high?

**M**

I think so.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. Plus there are profiles in there that are constraining them that I'm not aware of, which could be the case.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well the, you know, web service registry is UDDI patient discovery is XCPD and I have told you query is XDS, XCA and EBXL.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Does the XCPD specification delineate exactly where the services are that you can query for patient discovery or does it make that an implementers choice and has to be worked out region by region. Those are the kind of things that inhibit scale.

**M**

Right.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah and those are the things that a pilot really doesn't answer.

**M**

Yeah. Frankly, they don't, you're right.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay. I've got those two comments. So, we've got high here, we've got low here, I shouldn't just say here. Low industry adoption. High complexity. Other comments? I think you know with technology maturity, you know, certainly EBXML is declining but probably the other two are mature, right? You know XDXCA are mature, EBXML, so I think that probably right.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

You think XPCD is mature? Well, hum. The underlying technology maybe, which is basically so.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Well that's what we're really looking at in this.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Right. I don't think there is a whole lot of experience in using it outside of the pilot anywhere. I mean, that a healthcare specific invention, right?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yes. But that comes in over the adoption probably, well, yeah you're right, you're right. You're right. Because that's a, yeah that's a health care invention, so. Well but LDAP, XCPD is used as LDAP.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

The other thing is that none of those, none of the current specs reflect the recent work on Medi-Data, which is not their fault, they were written before the Medi-Data work happened, but I would guess that they might have to change to reflect some of the Medi-Data work, the inpatient.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

No. That will come in David, in our examination of alternatives. In fact, in my spreadsheet I've already identified that as alternatives. So, and that's part of the, let's go to the next one. These are the content specs and we have, let me tell you what these are okay. Document submission is T31, XDR and all of **ITIIG**. Exchange administrative distribution is T63. ....63 basically. Exchange retrieve is TP13, you know all of XDS, XCD, EBXML, etcetera, etcetera. And access consent policy is XACML. TP20 and TP30. And HIEM is SOAP and web services. So again, we'll make industry adoptions low. Okay. Are there other comments looking at technology maturity? Let's see.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

So consent policies you have, that's XACML. You have that as a maturing technology.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. XACML certainly is maturing. Yes.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Well it's certainly not mature.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Right. Would you...

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

The question is, is it actually progressing or it is frozen?

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

I don't know. I don't see it. I don't see a lot of pomp about it. I think, you know....and some of these newer approaches have just so dominated.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Maybe we could call that emerging and see if it emerges.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yes. It's still emerging. I mean it makes great sense on paper but it's got, it is one that requires so much pre-coordination.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

It really does and it lacks the data model.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Right.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. So think we should make that emerging.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

I mean, it's basically tantamount to saying work out some XML.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Exercise for the reader to do.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

Yeah. Left to the reader.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yeah. Exactly. Okay.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

I see here on my browser that DC has had a big earthquake, Judy are you still on the line, I hope we're not having, we're not.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

DC?

**Avinash Shanbhag – ONC – Director, NwHIN**

Yeah. We just now had stuff was shaking here. We are out.

**David McCallie – Cerner Corporation**

That's interesting.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

That certainly is. Well Wes and I are sitting here calmly right? Okay. So I think we have made a lot of progress here today and we'll update this. I'm going. We'll update the, make these changes that we've decided on today and we'll make them in the spreadsheet so that you can also see the, you know, the underlying specs and start suggesting these alternatives. I know that some more alternatives have already been suggested that didn't quite make the slides, but I think that that is what we need to do next and start looking at, you know, which of these are really ready for prime time if any, and what other emerging standards or existing standards should we suggest the ONC look at as possible alternatives. So are there any other comments before we open this for discussion? Okay. Judy, can we open this up for public comment then? Uh oh, Judy is not there. Is anybody there to open this up for public comment?

**Caitlin Collins – Altarum Institute**

Yes Dixie, one moment.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay.

**Caitlin Collins, Altarum Institute**

If you are on the phone and would like to make a public comment please press Star 1 at this time. If you are listening via your computer speakers you may dial 1-877-705-2976 and press Star 1 to be placed in the comment queue.

**Operator**

We have a question.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

That was a big earthquake huh?

**Operator**

We have a question from Karen Whiting. Please proceed.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Okay.

**Karen Whiting**

Hi this is Karen Whiting and I listened to your conversation. I'm very concerned with a lack of knowledge among the group. It didn't sound like there was an expert on the specifications and as an author or co-author of 5 of the specifications you were talking about and many of the underlying ones it is very concerning to me that it seems like you're not, you don't have anyone who is participating in this group who really understands the technology that you're talking about and I heard many, many technical inaccuracies being expressed and I simply lost track of them so I can't walk through them one by one, but I think that we'll make your job much harder if you're not really understanding what you're talking about and just as a general comment, for instance, all NHIN specifications are profiled on top of IHE they don't adopt HIE without profiling and they restrict the options and they specify what Medi-Data should be used and do all of the things that you guys are talking about as being a problem or at least most of them. So, the lack of actual knowledge about what these specifications actually say, document submission does not reference XDS at all, it is XDR only, that's all that is has, and it is a constraining of XDR in fact. I think that's very concerning. The other thing that I think is missing is people who have actually deployed and used the specifications. I didn't hear anyone saying I actually did this and had this actual experience. It's all second-hand, third-hand, fourth-hand information. And without the actual voice of someone who has tried to do it I'm wondering how accurate and consistent, you know, what you're doing exactly is going to be. So, I'm very concerned about the lack of expertise among the people who have a voice in this group. I would like to see the group opened up to some experts in the technical specification so that questions like "well what is this really doing" can be answered by someone who really does know and also by people who have actually tried to deploy or have currently deployed the specifications so that when you ask "well how hard is this really to do" someone who has first-hand knowledge of how hard it is to do is able to give a good informed opinion on that. Thank you.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Thank you.

**Caitlin Collins – Altarum Institute**

We have no more comment at this time.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

All right. Thank you all for dialing in. I appreciate it. And I think we have another meeting scheduled and I'm going to make sure it gets on my calendar so. I hope you're all able. This next meeting will be our last meeting before we present our recommendations in September I believe. So, well if we need to we can schedule another one, but let's hope, let's really try to make some major progress at the next meeting. All right. Thank you all.

**M**

Thanks Dixie.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications International Corporation – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Bye, bye.

## **Public Comment Received During the Meeting**

1. The fourth row should be split in two lines: combined use of Direct and XDR and XDM with SMTP, S/MIME.