

# Interoperability Standards enabling cross-border Patient Summary Exchange

Catherine CHRONAKI<sup>a,1</sup>, Ana ESTELRICH<sup>b</sup>, Giorgio CANGIOLI<sup>a</sup>, Marcello MELGARA<sup>c</sup>, Dipak KALRA<sup>d</sup>, Zabrina GONZAGA<sup>e</sup>, Larry GARBER<sup>f</sup>, Elaine BLECHMAN<sup>g</sup>, Jamie FERGUSON<sup>h</sup>, Stephen KAY<sup>i</sup>

<sup>a</sup>HL7 International Foundation, Belgium; <sup>b</sup>PHAST, France

<sup>c</sup>Lispa, Italy; <sup>d</sup>Eurorec, France; <sup>e</sup>Lantana Consulting Group, USA

<sup>f</sup>Atreus Health, USA; <sup>g</sup>Prosocial, USA; <sup>h</sup>Kaiser Permanente, USA; <sup>i</sup>NEN, Netherlands

**Abstract.** In an increasingly mobile world, many citizens and professionals are frequent travellers. Access during unplanned care to their patient summary, their most essential health information in a form physicians in another country can understand can impact not only their safety, but also the quality and effectiveness of care. International health information technology (HIT) standards such as HL7 CDA have been developed to advance interoperability. Implementation guides (IG) and IHE profiles constrain standards and make them fit for the purpose of specific use cases. A joint effort between HL7, IHE, and HealthStory created Consolidated CDA (C-CDA), a set of harmonized CDA IGs for the US that is cited in the Meaning Use II (MU-II) regulation. In the EU, the Patient Summary (PS) Guideline recently adopted, cites the epSOS IG also based on HL7 CDA, to support cross-border care in the EU and inform national eHealth programs. Trillium Bridge project supports international standards development by extending the EU PS Guideline and MU-II in the transatlantic setting. This paper presents preliminary findings from comparing patient summaries in the EU and US and reflects on the challenge of implementing interoperable eHealth systems in the cross-border or transatlantic setting.

**Keywords.** Patient summaries, eHealth interoperability, Meaningful Use, HL7 CDA

## Introduction

Interoperability has been part of national eHealth strategies for many years. Initially the focus was on technical interoperability and frequently limited to the in-hospital setting. Recently semantic and organizational interoperability are recognized as equally important as attention shifts toward patient empowerment and integrated care. In 2010, the Memorandum of Understanding on eHealth Cooperation between the European Commission and the United States Department of Health and Human Services recognized cooperation to advance eHealth/HIT as a driver for improved health and health care, economic growth, and innovation. The MoU highlighted HIT standards as a shared goal: “Development of internationally recognized and utilized interoperability standards and interoperability implementation specifications for electronic health record systems that meet high standards for security and privacy protection.”[1]. In the

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author

US, the Meaningful use program that has revolutionised healthcare by defining standards, IGs, certification criteria for Electronic Health Record technology and providing incentives for its use, cites HL7 CDA (see Table 1).

**Table 1.** HL7 CDA content exchange standards under Meaningful Use Stage II [2].

§ 170.205 Content exchange standards and implementation specifications for exchanging electronic health information.	
170.205(a)(3)	Consolidated CDA (C-CDA): Standardized representation of the Consult Note, Diagnostic Imaging Report, Discharge Summary, History and Physical, Operative Note, Procedure Note, Progress Note, and Continuity of Care Document (CCD).
170.205(h)	CDA Guide for Quality Reporting Document Architecture, Category I (QRDA-I): Standardized representation of quality data for an individual patient. Data in a QRDA-I report can be consumed by a calculation engine to determine if the patient met the numerator or denominator criteria for a given quality measure.
170.205(i)	CDA Guide for Reporting to Central Cancer Registries: Standardized cancer registry reporting format.
170.205(k)	CDA Guide for Quality Reporting Document Architecture, Category III (QRDA-III): Standardized representation of aggregate quality data (e.g. number of patients meeting the numerator criteria for a given quality measure).


On the 19th November 2013, the eHealth Network (eHN) established under article 14 of the EU Directive on patient’s rights in cross-border care [3] approved the guidelines on minimum/non-exhaustive patient summary (PS) dataset [4]. The aim of this guideline is primarily to support continuity of care and patient safety across borders focusing on emergency or unplanned care, but also to serve as a common baseline for patient summaries at national level. Patient summary is defined as the “*minimum set of information needed to assure healthcare coordination and continuity of care*” [4]. Emergency or unplanned care refers to “*the range of healthcare services available to people who need medical advice, diagnosis and/or treatment quickly and unexpectedly*” [4]. The guideline presents the *basic* dataset defined as the set of *essential* information from a clinical point of view that needs to be exchanged to deliver safe care to the patient, in the context of unplanned care. This information must be always available. In contrast, the *extended* dataset is defined as the minimum amount of *recommended* information that needs to be exchanged from a clinical point of view and should be completed whenever possible. Although the guideline serves as non-binding recommendation to the EU Member States (MS), it provides for the first time the technical, semantic and organizational framework for cross-border care noting the implications and responsibilities of the MS. The epSOS LSP ([www.epsos.eu](http://www.epsos.eu)) designed, built, and evaluated a service infrastructure that demonstrated cross-border interoperability between electronic health record systems and provided the background and practical experience for the PS guideline. Trillium Bridge ([www.trilliumbridge.eu](http://www.trilliumbridge.eu)) carries out a feasibility study for the EU/US electronic exchange of patient summaries. Starting with the gap analysis, it compares the C-CDA Continuity of Care Document (CCD) specification cited in MU-II [5] and the epSOS PS IG cited in the PS Guideline. Methodology and preliminary findings are presented and discussed below.

## 1. Methods

Trillium Bridge has adopted a five step strategy (shown in Figure 1) in its effort to establish an interoperability bridge across the Atlantic. Its findings intend to inform

international standardization efforts, promote high standards of quality and safety in cross-border care, and contribute to health system sustainability and economic growth:

- *Selecting the grounds:* Mobilize people and resources creating a forum of collaboration and knowledge sharing to select and analyse key use cases and to carry out gap analysis i.e. compare patient summary specifications and associated policies including eIdentification, authorisation, privacy & security.
- *Building the Bridge:* Assemble interoperability assets to align structure and terminology i.e. clinical document structures and semantic mappings for value sets published by the National Library of Medicine & epSOS.
- *Testing the Bridge:* Develop testing tools strategy and validate PS exchange.
- *Paving the Bridge:* Contribute to Policy Alignment, Standardization and Future Sustainability by *informing* development of PS IGs and template libraries in liaison with Standards Development Organizations to reduce the cost of standards and by *delivering* policy briefs in seven areas identified for policy alignment: cross-vendor integration, incentives, standardization, innovative business models, education, clinical research, security & privacy.



**Figure 1:** Trillium Bridge adopts a five step strategy in the feasibility study of transatlantic PS exchange.

## 2. Results

### 2.1. Selecting the Grounds

After establishing its community of knowledge, Trillium Bridge set out to collect user stories that reflect the need of patient summary exchange in the transatlantic setting: a woman that is a cancer survivor, a college student with known allergies, a retired businessman with hypertension and so on. All come down to a citizen crossing the Atlantic, who has access to his/her patient summary for unplanned care. Key questions are: “*Is it feasible to accurately communicate an EU patient summary or US C-CDA/CCD to physicians on the other side of the Atlantic?*” and “*Is it feasible to receive a report from a healthcare encounter on the other side of the Atlantic in a format that can be understood and incorporated in the health system back home?*” The Digital Agenda for Europe sets 2015 as the deadline for giving patients online access to their medical data (Key action 13) and epSOS pilots the Patient Access (PAC) service [7]. In the US, the BlueButton+ drives citizen’s access to their EHR data (<http://bluebuttonplus.org>). The EU PS Guideline cites the epSOS PS IG that uses HL7 CDA and has been designed as a dataset of “*essential and understandable health*

information” that is made “available at the point of care to deliver safe patient care.” On the other hand, C-CDA/CCD is a core data set of the most relevant administrative, demographic, and clinical information facts about a patient's healthcare, covering one or more healthcare encounters. It provides a means for one healthcare practitioner or system to aggregate all of the pertinent data about a patient and forward it to another practitioner or system to support continuity of care. The primary use case for the C-CDA/CCD is thus, to provide a snapshot in time containing the pertinent clinical, demographic, and administrative data for a specific patient. Mindful of the slightly different purpose, we compared the two specifications and associated terminologies in the clinical context of unplanned care. Figure 2 presents the common patient summary sections as reflected in Europe and the US. The coded section shared in the two documents are: medications, allergies, immunizations (vaccinations), problems, medical devices and implants. Several elements are richer in content in CCD (social history observation, results, vital signs, procedures, plan of care, and functional status). The EU PS guideline changed the optionality to mandatory in a few coded sections: surgeries past 6 months, treatment (plan of care), and autonomy (functional status).




Figure 2: Intersection of coded sections between EU PS Guideline and US C-CDA/CCD (clinical view point).

Significant aspect of this comparison relates to the value sets used in each coded section. Table 2 presents a subset of the equivalence mappings identified so far.

Table 2. Indicative equivalence mappings of value sets in selected coded sections.

Coded Section	C-CDA terminology	epSOS terminology
<b>Allergies</b>		
Allergy/Adverse Event Type	SNOMED CT	epSOSAdverseEventType/ epSOSReactionAllergy
Medication Clinical Drug Name Value Set	RxNORM	epSOSActiveIngredient ATC
<b>Immunizations/Vaccinations</b>		
Vaccine Admin Value Set	CDC Vaccine Code (CVX)	epSOSVaccine SNOMED CT
<b>Problem</b>		
Problem	SNOMED CT	epSOSIllnessesandDisorders ICD-10
<b>Medical Equipment</b>		
N/A		epSOSMedicalDevices SNOMED CT
<b>Medications</b>		
Medication Route FDA UnitsofMeasureCaseSensitive	FDA RouteofAdministration UCUM	epSOSRouteofAdministration epSOSUnits EDQM UCUM
<b>Vital Signs</b>		
Vital Sign Result	LOINC	epSOSBloodPressure LOINC

### 3. Discussion

There has always been tension between general purpose and highly constrained standards or IGs in eHealth. The less constrained a standard is, the more susceptible it is to local extensions, and inconsistent implementation. The proliferation of various types of templates does not make things any easier and the need for implementation guidance and pre-production interoperability testing is only partly met by IHE profiles and connectathons. Our early experience with Trillium Bridge confirms that a lot of ground work is needed to lower cost of implementation advancing interoperability in the widening space covered by eHealth. Only part of the effort to meet clinical needs and enable patient safety and high standards of care is technical. An infrastructure needs to be set up to facilitate service provision including translation, mapping and transcoding of terminologies, supported by a legal framework that acts as an enabler rather than inhibitor for cross-border care addressing security and privacy. According to the PS Guideline “*semantic mapping is a shared cross-border responsibility between respective Member States managed at the cross-border level and is part of its trust-building framework.*” Last but not least, there are cultural differences to be addressed across the board with education, training awareness raising and patient empowerment.

For the next steps, Trillium Bridge aims to define interoperability assets that are well-understood and fit for the purpose of validating the key use cases of presented a PS in the patient’s or the provider’s device transformed and transcoded in the language and format of the country of treatment. Findings of the gap analysis, interoperability assets and the results of the validation exercise will provide practical input to the feasibility study of Trillium Bridge, which aims to lower standards development costs accelerating convergence towards global standards. If successful, Trillium Bridge will be pivotal in lowering costs/barriers of transatlantic business engagement, but more importantly in supporting the fundamental right of citizens to their health information.

### References

- [1] Memorandum of Understanding between the United States Department of Health and Human Services and the European Commission on Cooperation surrounding health related information and communication technologies (ICT): [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/health/docs/policy/eu-usa-mou-ehealth-signed2010.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/health/docs/policy/eu-usa-mou-ehealth-signed2010.pdf)
- [2] Federal Register, Part II HHS, 45 CFR Part 170, 42 CFR Parts 412, 413, and 495; Electronic Health Record Incentive Program—Stage 2; HIT: Standards, Implementation Specifications, and Certification Criteria for EHR Technology, 2014 Ed; Revisions to the Permanent Certification Program for HIT; Final Rules September 2012, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-09-04/pdf/2012-21050.pdf>
- [3] Guideline on Minimum/non-exhaustive patient summary dataset for electronic exchange in accordance with the cross-border directive 2011/24/EU, 2013, [http://ec.europa.eu/health/ehealth/docs/guidelines\\_patient\\_summary\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/ehealth/docs/guidelines_patient_summary_en.pdf)
- [4] European Parliament and the Council of the European Union, Directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the application of patients’ rights in cross-border healthcare, 9 March 2011 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:en:PDF>
- [5] HL7 Implementation Guide for CDA® Release 2: IHE Health Story Consolidation, DSTU Release 1.1 (US Realm), Draft Standard for Trial Use, July 2012 [https://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product\\_brief.cfm?product\\_id=258](https://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=258)
- [6] epSOS D3.2.2 Final definition of functional service requirements- Patient Summary, Oct 29, 2012. [http://www.epsos.eu/uploads/tx\\_epsosfileshare/D3.2.2\\_Final\\_Definition\\_Functional\\_Service\\_Req\\_Patient\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.epsos.eu/uploads/tx_epsosfileshare/D3.2.2_Final_Definition_Functional_Service_Req_Patient_Summary.pdf)
- [7] epSOS D1.4.3 EED Services including specifications for all services. [http://www.epsos.eu/uploads/tx\\_epsosfileshare/D1.4.3\\_EED\\_Services\\_including\\_specifications\\_for\\_all\\_services\\_01.pdf](http://www.epsos.eu/uploads/tx_epsosfileshare/D1.4.3_EED_Services_including_specifications_for_all_services_01.pdf)