



The Office of the National Coordinator for  
Health Information Technology  
Health IT Advisory Committee

## U.S. Core Data for Interoperability Task Force

---

Christina Caraballo, co-chair  
Terry O'Malley, co-chair

April 11, 2018



# Agenda

- Call to Order / Roll Call (5 minutes)
- Overview of meeting (5 minutes)
- Review & Discuss draft Final Recommendation Letter (75 minutes)
  - » Overview & Interoperability
  - » Stages & Cadence
  - » Related issues
- Public comment (5 minutes)



The Office of the National Coordinator for  
Health Information Technology

Health IT Advisory Committee



## U.S. Core Data for Interoperability Task Force

---



@ONC\_HealthIT



@HHSOHC



# Appendix

# USCDI Task Force Membership

First Name	Last Name	Organization
<b><i>Co-Chairs</i></b>		
Christina	Caraballo	Get Real Health
Terry	O'Malley	Massachusetts General Hospital
<b><i>Members</i></b>		
Nancy	Beavin	Humana
Rich	Elmore	Allscripts
Valerie	Grey	New York eHealth Collaborative
Leslie	Hall	Healthwise
Rob	Havasy	HIMSS
Laura	Heermann-Langford	Intermountain Healthcare
Eric	Heflin	Sequoia Project
Ken	Kawamoto	University of Utah Health
Steven	Lane	Sutter Health
Clem	McDonald	National Library of Medicine
Kim	Nolen	Pfizer
Brett	Oliver	Baptist Health
Mike	Perretta	Docket
Dan	Vreeman	Regenstrief Institute, Inc

# U.S. Core Data for Interoperability (USCDI) Charge

- **Overarching Charge:** Review and provide feedback on the U.S. Core Data for Interoperability (USCDI) structure and process.
- **Specific Charge:** Provide recommendations on the following:
  - » Mechanisms/approaches to receive stakeholder feedback regarding data class priorities;
  - » The proposed categories to which data classes would be promoted and objective characteristics for promotion;
  - » How the USCDI would be expanded and by how much; and
  - » Any factors associated with the frequency with which it would be published.

# General Terminology

- Stakeholder – anyone with a vested interest in the USCDI
- Candidate Status - Data class has achieved technical level such that it can be tested in production settings
- Emerging Status - Data class has been defined and its future applications demonstrated
- USCDI Status - Data class is fully ready to be implemented in real-life settings
- Normative – Parts of a standard that specify what implementers should conform to
- Provenance – describes metadata, or extra information about data, that can help answer questions such as when and who created the data.
- Data element - single item with specific definition
- Data set - a group of data elements combined by a single stakeholder to serve a specific purpose
- Data class - a group of data elements that serve one or more purposes for more than one stakeholder
- Net value - equals value minus cost where the scale can be any type of cost or value (time, money, safety, quality, burden, etc.)
- Aggregate value: the combined net value derived by all stakeholders from implementing a specific data class

# Prioritization Criteria

## Characteristics of the Data Class

- Important to a high priority domain
- Based on TEP, Standards body type of review, real time consensus e.g. ISA
- Ease of standardization
- Currently being collected
- Mature standards exist
- Standards exist and are in production use
- High value to many domains
- Captured within current workflows
- "Capturability"
- Viewed as a critical need by someone
- Value to future workflows

## Characteristics of the Stakeholder

- Provider/Clinician
- Consumer/Individual/Family
- Payer/Insurance
- Regulator
- Contributes to a valued health outcome
- Researcher
- Public health

## Characteristics of the Data Management Process

- Cost
- Availability

## Characteristics of the Domain

- High volume
- High cost
- High failure rate
- Cuts across other domains/broad applicability

## Characteristics of the Subject Population

- High risk
- High utilizers
- Policy Priority



# Workplan

Meeting Date	Potential Discussion Items
February 21, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss USCDI Task Force charge scope and feedback</li> </ul>
February 28, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed categories to which data classes would be promoted</li> </ul>
March 7, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanisms and approaches to receive stakeholder feedback regarding data classes and elements</li> </ul>
March 14, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective characteristics for data class promotion                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare Draft Recommendations for HITAC review</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>March 21, 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Draft recommendations shared with HITAC committee</b></li> <li>• Continued discussion on objective characteristics</li> </ul>
March 28, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the USCDI would be expanded and by how much</li> <li>• Frequency of USCDI publication and associated factors</li> </ul>
April 4, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm Stage Criteria</li> <li>• Feedback for Final Recommendations</li> </ul>
April 11, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update and refine recommendations</li> </ul>
April 17, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize recommendations</li> </ul>
<b>April 18, 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Present recommendations to full HITAC Committee</b></li> </ul>

# Reference Materials

- ONC draft USCDI document – “Draft U.S. Core Data for Interoperability and Proposed Expansion Process” (January 5, 2018)
- White paper by Dixie Baker, et al, “Evaluating and classifying the readiness of technology specifications for national standardization.”
- Health IT Standards Committee recommendation letter incorporating Standards & Interoperability Task Force recommendations (March 26, 2015)