




WP8B – Use Case 2

Sharing health and medical data among healthcare organizations

Authors: *Dario Cerizza and Emanuele Della Valle*

- This WP will test TripCom infrastructure for an application that is focused in exchanging patient records among healthcare organizations or among different units within the same organization
- This WP takes the results from WP1-5 through the integration of the results by WP6



- WP Leader
 - CEFRIEL - 12 person-months - Dario Cerizza


- WP Partners:
 - LFUI – 6 person-months – Reto Krummenacher
 - NUIG – 2 person-months – Doug Foxvog
 - TUW – 4 person-months – Martin Murth
 - FUB – 2 person-months – Elena Paslaru Simperl
 - ONTO – 3 person-months – Vassil Momtchev
 - TID – 8 person-months – Sara Carro

- 37 person-months in total

■ The eHealth

- is a scenario in which **the integration problem** is amplified by
 - the **intensive use of knowledge**,
 - the need of accurately handling citizens' **privacy**, and
 - ***live or death implications***.
- has been **seeking for *interoperability*** since late '90s,
- is under deployment in many country
 - **UK**: NHS Care Record Spine
 - <http://www.connectingforhealth.nhs.uk/>
 - **Nederland**: NICTIZ - AORTA
 - <http://www.nictiz.nl/>
 - **Canada**: EHRS
 - <http://www.infoway-inforoute.ca>

- **Securely sharing health data among healthcare organizations remains an open challenge.**



2006-2007 Focus: Interoperability

What to address in interoperability

Specific topics are currently identified by EU Ministries of Health and ICT (*eHealth Working Group*)

- Patient summary
- Patient/practitioner identifiers
- Emergency data set

eHealth Stakeholder's group (Users, Industry, Experts) is currently working on these issues

Goal: European Commission: RECOMMENDATION on interoperability

Ilias Iakovidis (Deputy Head of Unit – ICT for Health, DG INFOSO, EC)
"European Commission activities in e-Health: The achievements and future prospects." Med-e-Tel Luxembourg, April 5, 2006

1987 HL7 v1.x - it never got adopted

1995 HL7 v2.x - large adoption especially in USA

1999 CEN/TC 251 - the first to introduce, with CEN ENV 13606 / EHRcom, an **information model** and a methodological approach for deriving concrete interoperable messages

2002 GEHR/openEHR - proposal of the **archetype** concept and of a two-level methodology

2004 HL7 v.3 - definition of an Information Model (RIM) that is the ultimate source from which all HL7 v3 protocol specification standards draw their information related content.

} Attempt for specifying the format of each of the message that can be exchanged among any pair of systems...

} Attempt for specifying an **information model** and deriving all messages and protocol specification from such information model and formal terminologies (e.g. LOINC, SNOMED, etc.)

- The proposals for **standardizing** an application protocol for the health care sector are all **similar** in concept and capabilities
- They try to **address the interoperability** problem by
 - **introducing a shared conceptual model** (i.e., an ontology),
 - **deriving message structure from such conceptual model** so that semantics is encoded in the definition of each element of data including its relationship with other elements,
 - **defining the information**, which can be carried by each message, **using standard medical terminologies** (e.g., LOINC, SNOMED, INN, ICD, etc.)
 - **binding** the resulting messages to “*the technology of the day*”, meaning EDI in the '90, XML and **Web Services** today, who-knows-what tomorrow

■ **Message-based communication**

- has proven efficient and effective for certain activities in this area (i.e., hospital **administration**), but
- has shown some problems to effectively and seamlessly collecting and integrating data from electronic health records

■ **When addressing the problem of collecting and integrating data** from electronic health records, at least two are the **possible solutions**:

- Building **centralized databases** that would
 - contain all the medical records on every patient
 - incorporate all of the different access rules and policies regarding different users and different levels of access
- **Exchanging messages only when needed**
 - In this way no central repository is required and the ownership of the data seems respected

- The *cost* of building the infrastructure and collecting the data is enormous,
- the centralized repository approach creates *competitive and security issues* about who controls and has access to the information on a specific patient,
- the *difficulty in maintaining up-to-date* a repository originating from a large number of independently evolving systems, and
- last but not least a message once sent (especially in an asynchronous scenario) gives the owner a *sense of disengagement instead of* strengthening the sense of *ownership*

- Each recipient must *know in advance where to look for information*,
- each recipient must *know in advance the terminology* (e.g., SNOMED, LOINC) *to use* when asking for a specific record content,
- each recipient ends up maintaining *a specific interface for each system* it has to interact with, and
- *mining* (for disease prevention, early diagnosis, pharmaceutical research, enhancement of patient safety) *becomes almost impossible* due to the large amount of messages to be exchanged

- **It is a realistic solution for the data ownership problem** because healthcare organizations will not lose their control over resources and they will be able to share information only with those that are authorized
- **It provides a simple way to guarantee consistency** because health data won't be neither transmitted or copied but simple used
- **It supplies a straight forward way to deal with integrity** because data won't be transmitted and it should be impossible for anybody, but the owner, to modify the data
- **It is a cost-effective solution** because additional storage resources (and related management cost) are drastically reduced

- T8B.1: M1-M6
 - eHealth **Requirements Analysis** and State of the Art
- T8B.2: M7-M12
 - **Determination of indicators** for performance, security, quality and impact analysis
- T8B.3: M16-M22
 - **Prototype** of a TripCom application towards the eHealth scenario
- T8B.4: M23-M24
 - **Feedback** report to architecture work package
- T8B.5: M23-M36
 - Development of a “**Best Practice Guide**” for the development eHealth solutions
- T8B.6: M23-M36
 - **Evaluation** and application of the Prototype in Use Case Scenarios
- T8B.7: M31-M36
 - **Prototype** implementation **refinement**

- D8B.1: Led by CEFRIEL – Delivery Date: M12
 - State of the art and **requirements analysis** for sharing health data in the Triple Space
 - Estimated person-months: 12

- D8B.2: Led by CEFRIEL – Delivery Date: M30
 - **Prototype** of TripCom application for sharing health data among healthcare organizations
 - Estimated person-months: 19

- D8B.3: Led by TUW – Delivery Date: M36
 - **Assessment** of the developed solution with regards to the detected indicators
 - Estimated person-months: 6