CQWG Notes 09/13/13

Workplan charges from HITSC to CQWG can be summarized in 4 major areas:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Specs | Capture | Calculate | Output |  |
| Quality Measurement | HQMF/QRDA |  | QueryHealth,  HQMF | QRDA1/3 | explicit logical expression of QMs-- do you agree that HQMF R1 doesn't work? Would HQMF R2 work? Do we need to work further on aligning a specification for a new technical standard (i.e. HQMF R2.5) that would share a logical expression format with HeD? |
| Clinical Decision Support | VMR/GELLO |  |  | HeD | Would you advise that ONC should be working on a CDS standard so CDS artifacts can be shared? Should there be an API standard so users can incorporate standard CDS artifacts into their systems/practices?-- currently the containers are different but the first step should be unifying the expression to avoid vendors creating disperate parsing structures |
| Defects |  | SNI Framework |  | ? To PSO | See below-- relevant to Structured Data Capture |
| Registries |  | SNI Framework |  | ? | Structured Data Capture: Use cases of clinical registries and structured data to PSOs-- is the approach of SDC S&I (standardizing structured data elements for sharing to be used for multiple purposes) the best approach? |

**Two Major Topics for CQWG Comment and Discussion:**

Topic 1: Quality Measurement/ Clinical Decision Support 🡪 Unification of Logic and Expression Model

Topic 2: Structured Data Capture for Defects 🡪 Patient Safety Organizations and Registry Data

**Topic 1: Logic/expression language changes and model unification in harmonizing VMR/QDM—which comes first?**

General consensus of the group is that harmonization of both logic and model of CQMs and CDS are dependent on both expression and model simultaneously—do not recommend that the process should be done piecemeal

* CIMI, detailed clinical models, and Open Air representation of data is fundamental before logic
* Some analogy to SHARPEND work with ONC in normalizing data to CIMI where rendering data required comparability and reproducibility

The CQWG could ask itself:

Are data representation standards (specifically HQMF) sufficient for specifying quality measurement at the current time?

But it SHOULD ask:

What are the principles we want to represent? How and what should we evaluate whether a standard in general is sufficient and complete?

THEN we should APPLY those principles to the standards under scrutiny. For example:

* Does the expression allow for access to the correct set of data elements?
* Does the logic expression support the basic Boolean elements needed for CDS/CQM?

Why does this matter? We are being asked to evaluate proposed standards for specific purposes in MU3 rulemaking…

Strategies to examine the adequacy of these proposed standards:

* Look to S&I Framework and CIMI to enumerate existing content and standards

🡪 Technically development of requirements should have predated this work

* Nevertheless, more work on these standards is ongoing and this is a good opportunity to catch up and establish best practices—contract has started for harmonization of QDM and VMR so need to move on standards with them

TIMELINES are key:

* January ballot might start harmonization process of the two models
* Group should also discuss appropriateness of timeline to address all the needs of both model and expression layer
* Improving HQMF R1->R2->R2.5 seems on the surface appropriate but shouldn’t make surface judgment without principles for the analysis created beforehand

CQWG also needs to discuss again (given the hiatus) the goals of the group as well as the terms of reference and the scope of work

* Should avoid overlap with other HITSC workgroups
* Should gather information from harmonization contract team and OST and HITSC on where the work is now and where it is trying to go

For the asks:

* HQMF R1 generally agreed upon as insufficient for needs
* HQMF R2 generally agreed as a significant improvement but does not address all improvements – has the benefit of having been balloted already
  + Trial implementation demonstrates reliable calculation (via both MITRE and GE)
  + DSTU close to publication but rule/implementation would be in <2 years potentially—more pilots are needed
* HeD pilots have already started but don’t include any of the harmonization work—will this be wasted effort?
  + TSC recently discussed ballots—they are currently moving towards reconciliation and were discussed through HL7
* Are HQMF R2 and HeD aligned?
  + In some areas but not others
  + Differences in expression languages represent some of the major differences
  + CIMI work has not been published or balloted
* Actual immediate potential of this work: Harmonization for technical requirements could work initially on similar but not the same concepts
* It has been and remains a struggle to determine how to eliminate variability in the application of the QDM to logic, VS
* There is a real issue of governance:
  + Can we ensure standards are applied consistently?
  + Would HQMF R2 resolve that?
  + Would still need expert implementation/testing guidance

**Take Home Points:**

* **An honest assessment of any standard is not reasonable without the establishment of basic principles as a benchmark for comparison**
* **For next meeting will focus on principles for:**
  + **Aligning two or more standards**
  + **What are the basic requirements of an adequate/complete standard?**