Because we need a model
What have we heard so far?

- Survey #1
- Implementation-A-Thon #1
C-CDA Survey #1 Respondent Categories

- Vendor: 36%
- HIE: 34%
- Govt / University / Non-Profit: 9%
- Provider: 9%
- Other: 12%
C-CDA R2.1 Adoption Readiness

- Actively Developing, Planning or Investigating: 88%
- Other: 12%
- None: 0%
C-CDA Sender / Receiver Capability

C-CDA Senders

- Yes: 76%
- No: 24%

C-CDA Receivers

- Yes: 84%
- No: 16%
C-CDA Supported Document Types

- CCD
- Discharge Summary
- Referral Note

Send
Receive
C-CDA Common Issues

- **Terminology**
  - Value set accessibility
  - Inconsistent usage
  - Use of non-compliant vocabulary

- **Optionality**
  - More than one way to do things
  - Inconsistent implementations across vendors

- **Complexity**
  - Difficult to understand and consume
  - Lack of clearly documented examples
Validation Tools / Educational Offerings / IATs

- **Validation Tools Usage**
  - Yes: 89%
  - No: 11%

- **Accessed HL7 Education**
  - Yes: 77%
  - No: 23%

- **IAT Interest**
  - Yes: 83%
  - No: 17%
HL7 C-CDA Implementation-A-Thons
C-CDA Implementation-A-Thon #1 summary

January 7-8, 2016 UCF Executive Development Centre in Orlando
C-CDA Implementation-A-Thon #1 summary

- **Thursday, January 7, 2016**
  - 0900-1000 Introductions
  - 1000-1200 CCD Testing
  - 1200-1300 Lunch
  - 1300-1400 CCD Testing (ctnd)
  - 1400-1700 Discharge Summary Testing

- **Friday, January 8, 2016**
  - 0900-1200 Referral Note Testing
  - 1200-1300 Lunch
  - 1300-1500 Discussion about Testing
  - 1500-1600 Discussion about next IaT
### C-CDA IAT #1 Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminology</strong></td>
<td>• LOINC codes not always understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UCUM was an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inconsistent vocabulary choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td>• Single primary language support by some vendors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Binary advanced directives only in some systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>• Data point variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variations in template choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ID usage is an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stylesheet usage can be an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambiguity</strong></td>
<td>• Unclear documentation requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multiple places to record similar information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of open templates is unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WE WANT YOU!
How can you be heard?

- What’s next?
  - Upcoming Survey #2
  - Upcoming Implementation-A-Thon #2
What will HL7 do with this?

- Implementers
- Surveys / Implementation-A-Thons
- C-CDA R2.1 Companion Guide
- HL7
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Companion Guide Purpose?

- Supplement C-CDA R2.1 Implementation Guide
- Map Common Clinical Data Set (CCDS) to C-CDA locations
- Provide technical guidance re: 2015 Ed. CEHRT data requirements
- Include clinically-valid examples
- Recommend implementation approach to achieve ONC Certification
How to participate

• Community Outreach via listservs
• Ballot Review

• C-CDA Survey #2
• Implementation-A-Thon #2
  – April 14-15 2016
  – Chicago, IL
WE WANT YOU!
Improving C-CDA
Listening to Implementers

Jean Duteau: jean@duteaudesign.com
Joginder Madra: joginder.madra@madraconsulting.com