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My Goals for this Meeting

- Agree to a simple, doable project that we can work on together that has value for clinicians
- Figure out how to fund a project
- Propose a process for industry wide approval of a set of models to support true interoperability (a stepwise process)
Outline

- Current situation and a vision for the future
- What is plug-n-play interoperability?
- The path to interoperability
Graphic of a Detailed Clinical Model

- SystolicBP
  - data: 138 mmHg
  - quals
  - BodyLocation
    - data: Right Arm
  - PatientPosition
    - data: Sitting

LOINC

SNOMED CT
Why?

“To help people live the healthiest lives possible.”
Homer Warner and HELP

Intermountain can only provide the highest quality, lowest cost health care with the use of advanced clinical decision support systems integrated into frontline clinical workflow.

Dr. Homer Warner
Decision Support Modules

- Antibiotic Assistant
- Ventilator weaning
- ARDS protocols
- Nosocomial infection monitoring
- MRSA monitoring and control
- Prevention of Deep Venous Thrombosis
- Infectious disease reporting to public health
- Diabetic care
- Pre-op antibiotics
- ICU glucose protocols
- Ventilator disconnect
- Infusion pump errors
- Lab alerts
- Blood ordering
- Order sets
- Patient worksheets
- Post MI discharge meds
We can’t keep up!

- We have ~150 decision support rules or modules
- We have picked the low hanging fruit
- There is a need to have 5,000+ decision support rules or modules
- There is no path from 150 to get to 5,000 unless we fundamentally change the ecosystem
Current Situation

• Each EHR vendor uses a proprietary database schema, proprietary models and unique terminology to represent clinical data
  • Some standardization of codes is now occurring, but
  • Data is not consistent vendor to vendor, or even organization to organization within the same vendor

• This means that:
  • Sharing data is difficult
  • Sharing executable software across vendors is impossible
  • Each useful application is created or re-created on each different platform
  • There are unmet needs for health care applications and decision support
  • Software costs are higher than they need to be
The Future Ecosystem

- Standards are defined that enable “truly” interoperable systems using standards based services

- Old and new EHR vendors:
  - Support standards based services (HL7 FHIR®)
  - Support SMART® applications

- Thousands of people develop software that runs on truly interoperable platforms
  - Open source, academics, and for profit developers
  - Apps, including clinical decision support algorithms, are for sale in a vendor neutral app store
  - Apps can be certified as HSPC compliant
  - Platform vendors certify apps as safe for use in their platform
The Future Ecosystem (2)

- People buy a patient data platform
  - Includes auditing, security, authorization, patient selection, etc.
  - May include some core apps: order entry, results review, notification, etc.
- People buy the apps they need
- There is also a marketplace for sharing knowledge, especially protocols, workflows, order sets, ontologies
- Patients receive better care at a lower cost because lower cost higher quality apps are available as driven by market forces
SMART on FHIR®© – Open Platform Architecture

FHIR Profiles from CIMI Models

Heterogeneous Systems Exhibiting Health IT Systems

SOA Orchestration

mHealth
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FHIR REST API

Web Apps

Registry Applications
- Data from EHR
- User entered data
- Decision support

http://smartplatforms.org/smart-on-fhir/
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Apps that enable data sharing...

- Next-gen Interoperability
  - Disease and quality registries
  - Population Health integration
  - HIE integration
  - Data capture for research
  - Clinical Trial recruiting

![Diagram showing Cancer Registry connected to EHR 1, EHR 2, and EHR 3]
The Interoperable App Development Process

- **Project Needs**
  - Pediatric Growth Chart
  - Neonatal Bilirubin
  - OPA Data Collection
  - MQIP
  - ACC registries
  - Comm Acq Pneumonia
  - Etc.

- **Domain Analysis**
- **Create Logical Models (CIMI)**
- **Approve Models**
- **Model Repository**
- **Termiology Server (SOLOR)**
- **Create Physical Artifacts (FHIR Profiles)**
- **Artifact Repository (FHIR profiles)**
- **Conformance Testing**
- **Create Software (Apps, CDS)**
# Model Repository and Model Adoption

## Model Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Id</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Isosemantic Family</th>
<th>Model content</th>
<th>Meta data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hematocrit</td>
<td>DSTU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood Pressure</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4578</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Rate</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4190</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Cell Count</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Glucose</td>
<td>DSTU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Bilirubin</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5367</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Model Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Id</th>
<th>Realm</th>
<th>Use Case</th>
<th>Meta data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heart Rate</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Public Health Reporting</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hematocrit</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Standard Lab Results</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Glucose</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>MU Quality Measure</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Glucose</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>CIMI</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Glucose</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>openEHR</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Bilirubin</td>
<td>HSPC</td>
<td>Neonatal Bilirubin App</td>
<td>YYY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The path to interoperability
What is HL7 FHIR®?

- A set of modular components called “Resources”
- Resources refer to each other using URLs
  - Build a web to support healthcare process
- Exchange resources between systems
  - Using a RESTful API (e.g. web approach)
  - As a bundle of resources (messages, documents)
FHIR: Core Resources

AdverseReaction
Alert
AllergyIntolerance
CarePlan
Composition
ConceptMap
Condition
Conformance
Device
DeviceObservationReport
DiagnosticOrder
DiagnosticReport
DocumentReference
DocumentManifest
Encounter
FamilyHistory
Group
ImagingStudy
Immunization
ImmunizationRecommendation
List
Location
Media
Medication
MedicationAdministration
MedicationDispense
MedicationPrescription
MedicationStatement
MessageHeader
Observation
OperationOutcome
Order
OrderResponse
Organization
Other
Patient
Practitioner
Procedure
Profile
Provenance
Query
Questionnaire
RelatedPerson
SecurityEvent
Specimen
Substance
Supply
ValueSet
Example: Fetch a systolic blood pressure

GET https://open-api.fhir.me/Observation/8567?_format=json

{
  "resourceType": "Observation",
  "text": {
    "status": "generated",
    "div": "1999-07-02: Systolic blood pressure = 109 mm[Hg]<div>"
  },
  "name": {
    "coding": [
      {
        "system": "http://loinc.org",
        "code": "8480-6",
        "display": "Systolic blood pressure"
      }
    ]
  },
  "valueQuantity": {
    "value": 109.0,
    "units": "mm[Hg]",
    "code": "mm[Hg]"
  },
  "appliesDateTime": "1999-07-02",
  "status": "final",
  "subject": {
    "reference": "Patient/1186747"
  }
}
Observation Resource

Observation (DomainResource)
identifier : Identifier [0..*]
status : code [1..1] « ObservationStatus! »
code : CodeableConcept [1..1] « LOINC ?? »
subject : Reference [0..1] « Patient|Group|Device|Location »
encounter : Reference [0..1] « Encounter »
effective[x] : Type [0..1] « dateTime|Period »
value[x] : Type [0..1]
  « Quantity|CodeableConcept|string|Range|Ratio|SampledData|Attachment|time|dateTime|Period »
interpretation : CodeableConcept [0..1] « Observation Interpretation+ »
method : CodeableConcept [0..1] « Observation Methods?? »
specimen : Reference [0..1] « Specimen »
device : Reference [0..1] « Device|DeviceMetric »
Profile for “Blood pressure”

**Observation = Blood Pressure**
Subject.reference: Patient URL
Coding: LOINC 55284-4

**Related:**
- type: has-component
target.reference: Observation URL
- type: has-component
target.reference: Observation URL

**Observation = Systolic BP**
name: “Systolic”
coding: LOINC 8480-6
value.units: “mmHg”

**Observation = Diastolic BP**
name: “Diastolic”
coding: LOINC 8462-4
value.units: “mmHg”
Progress

• FHIR is easy to implement

• FHIR has unprecedented support from EHR vendors

• SMART on FHIR Applications at Intermountain Healthcare
  • In use – Pediatric growth chart, Pediatric drug card, BP Centiles
  • In development – HIE viewer, Pulmonary Embolus diagnosis and management

• University of Utah collaborations
  • ONC Challenge grant: Neonatal bilirubin app
  • ONC High Impact grant: Surgery transition app
## LOINC Codes for Blood Pressure

Search generated 465 hits in 0.028 secs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOINC</th>
<th>LongName</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76532-1</td>
<td>Blood pressure device Cuff pressure</td>
<td>Cuff pressure</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8470-7</td>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure 10 hour mean</td>
<td>Intravascular diastolic</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>10H'meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8471-5</td>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure 12 hour mean</td>
<td>Intravascular diastolic</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>12H'meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8468-1</td>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure 1 hour mean</td>
<td>Intravascular diastolic</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>1H'meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8472-3</td>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure 24 hour mean</td>
<td>Intravascular diastolic</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>24H'meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8469-9</td>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure 8 hour mean</td>
<td>Intravascular diastolic</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>8H'meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8488-9</td>
<td>Systolic blood pressure 10 hour mean</td>
<td>Intravascular systolic</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>10H'meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8489-7</td>
<td>Systolic blood pressure 12 hour mean</td>
<td>Intravascular systolic</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>12H'meas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The danger

- No true interoperability because
  - Vendors use different models/profiles
  - Government agencies use different models/profiles
  - Provider organizations use different models/profiles
  - Professional organizations use different models/profiles
CIMI

- The Clinical Information Modeling Initiative (CIMI) is an HL7 Work Group that is producing detailed clinical information models to enable interoperability of health care information systems.
- CIMI was initiated during a “Fresh Look” session at an HL7 meeting in 2011.
- CIMI models are free for use for all purposes.
CIMI Goals

• Create a shared repository of detailed clinical information models

• Repository is open to everyone and models are licensed free for use at no cost

• Where the models:
  • Are expressed in an approved formalism
    • Archetype Definition Language (ADL)
    • Archetype Modeling Language (AML)
  • Are based on a core reference model, including a set of base data types
  • Have formal bindings to standard coded terminologies
CIMI Model Development Lifecycle

Standards Infusion

- CIMI RM

- Standard Terminologies (SOLOR) & Ontologies

Initial Loading of Repository

- CEMs
- DCMs
- CDA Templates
- openEHR
- FHIM
- ISO EN 13606 Archetypes
- LRA Models
- FHIM Resources

Repository of Shared Models in an approved Formalism

Model Submission

Translators

- Model Dissemination
- CEM
- V2 "I"
- LRA
- V2 XML
- HTML
- V3 XML
- AML
- ADL
- CDA
- OWL
- SOA Payload
- CEN Archetype
- CDISC SHARE
- Localization & Context Specialization

FHIM

Legos

Standard Terminologies (SOLOR) & Ontologies
Healthcare Services Platform Consortium

MISSION

Improve health by creating a vibrant, open ecosystem of interoperable applications, content, and services
Membership

- **3 Benefactor members**
  - Veterans Administration
  - Louisiana State University Health
  - Intermountain Healthcare

- **Key alliances**
  - Center for Medical Interoperability (C4MI)
  - OSEHRA

- **3 Associate (organizational) members**
  - Regenstrief
  - Motive
  - Allscripts

- **11 Individual members**

- **Society Members**: AMA, MHII and ACOG
HSPC Initiatives

- Be a provider led collaboration agent
- Create a reference implementation of common SOA
- Develop terminology and information models for true semantic interoperability
- Support authoring and sharing of knowledge content
- Obtain implementation and adoption of approved standards
- Create a shared technical environment to enable simple and efficient development
Appendix
Working with FHIR Resource Owners

- DAF: FHIM Profil
- FHIM
- CIMI (logical model)
- openEHR
- Other FHIR Profiles

Feedback

(Different realms and use cases)
Value Add from CIMI

FHIM Classes

Observation

Patient Obs

Family Hx Obs

Lab Obs

Qn Lab Obs

Qual Lab Obs

Titer Lab Obs

FHIM Subtypes

Hematocrit

Serum Glucose

Urine Sodium

Invariant Profile Structure – CIMI Leaf Node Content
Argonauts and CIMI

- We agree with the need for everything the Argonauts are doing.

- Current scope of the Argonaut work will not achieve true plug-n-play interoperability
  - Meaningful use common data elements
  - DAF profiles (high level profiles)
  - Small number of detailed models
    - Vital signs (measurements only, no qualifying information)

- CIMI adds detailed content for plug-n-play interoperability
  - Lab measurements
  - Patient measurements
  - Physical exam
  - Intake and Output
  - Assessment instruments: Apgars, Braden, Pain Scales, etc.
IsoSemantic Models – Example of Problem
(from Dr. Linda Bird)

e.g. “Suspected Lung Cancer”
Data Comes in Different Shapes and Colors

- Finding – Suspected Lung Cancer
- Finding – Suspected Cancer
  Location – Lung
- Finding – Cancer
  Location – Lung
  Certainty – Suspected

(Let’s say this is the preferred shape)
Data Standardized in the Service

Application and User

Data in preferred shape and color

Shape and color translation

Shape and color of data in the local database
Partial Interoperability

Application

Application and User

Standard Terms (Non-standard Structure)

Term Translators

Local databases, CDA, HL7 V.2, etc.
Preferred Strategy – Full Interoperability

Application

Application and User

Standard Structure
AND Standard Terms
(As defined by CIMI Models)

Term and Structure Translators

Local databases, CDA, HL7 V.2, etc.
Reasons to do it on the server side

- Person writing the translation is most likely to understand the meaning of the data in their own database.
- The person writing the translation only has to understand their own data and the preferred model.
  - They can optimize query execution for their own system.
- The query for the data is simpler. If the application has to write a query that will work for all shapes, the query will be inefficient to process by every system.
The Value of “Truly” Interoperable Systems
The cost of medical software

- Becker’s Health IT & CIO Review

- Partners HealthCare: $1.2 billion
  Boston-based Partners HealthCare is one of more recent implementations, going live the first week of June to the tune of $1.2 billion. This is the health system’s biggest investment to date. The implementation process took approximately three years, and in that time, the initial price tag of $600 million doubled.

- Intermountain Medical Center $550 million
ACOs and Registries

Apps that enable data sharing...

- Next-gen Interoperability
  - Population Health integration
  - HIE integration
  - Data capture for research
  - Clinical Trial recruiting
  - Quality Repositories
Medical and Health Research vs. Health Care Spending in the U.S.

(from Research America)
The start of a Learning Healthcare System is accurate, computable, data.
More Reasons

- Agile software development
  - Widely distributed
  - Directed daily by front line clinicians
  - Increased usability of software, creativity, innovation

- Increased choice in software
  - Thousands of independent developers
  - Centrally planned economy vs free market
  - Think “app store for healthcare” or of innovations like Uber