



Query-Based Document Exchange Implementation Guide

Version 0.1

May 28, 2015

DRAFT

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	4
2.0	Definition of Roles.....	4
2.1.	Query Initiator	5
2.2.	Query Responder	5
2.3.	Record Locator Service (RLS)	5
3.0	Customizable Principles of Trust.....	6
3.1.	Permitted Purposes	6
3.2.	Full Participation	6
3.3.	Permitted Users	7
3.4.	Data Sufficiency and Integrity	7
3.5.	Service Level Agreements	7
3.6.	Customizable Flow-downs	7
4.0	Non-Discrimination	7
4.1.	Treatment.....	8
4.2.	Other Permitted Purposes	8
4.3.	Consistency in Additional Terms and Conditions	8
4.4.	Record Locator Services	9
5.0	Performance Measures.....	9
5.1.	Acceleration.....	9
5.2.	Seamless Connectivity.....	10
5.2.1.	<i>Breadth and Scale</i>	10
5.2.2.	<i>Adoption and Volume</i>	10
5.3.	Interoperable Exchange	10
6.0	Evidence of Compliance.....	10
6.1.	Application Process.....	11
6.2.	Technical Testing and Ongoing Verification	11
6.2.1.	<i>Assertion of Compliance</i>	12
6.2.2.	<i>Non-Production Partner Test</i>	12
6.2.3.	<i>Production Connectivity Validation – Pre-Live</i>	12
6.2.4.	<i>Production Connectivity Validation – Ongoing</i>	14
7.0	Query-Based Document Exchange Use Case	15
7.1.	Background.....	15
7.2.	Use Case: Query Systems For Patient Information (XCPD/XCA).....	15
7.2.1.	<i>Actors</i>	15
7.2.2.	<i>Assumptions</i>	15
7.2.3.	<i>Pre-conditions</i>	16

7.2.4.	<i>Use Case Steps – “Nominal Flow”</i>	16
7.2.5.	<i>Post-conditions</i>	17
7.2.6.	<i>Alternate Flows</i>	17
7.2.7.	<i>Error Flows</i>	25
8.0	Technical Requirements and Guidance	29
8.1.	<i>Roles</i>	29
8.1.1.	<i>Query Initiator</i>	29
8.1.2.	<i>Query Responder</i>	29
8.1.3.	<i>Record Locator Service</i>	29
8.2.	<i>Overall Query Workflow</i>	29
8.2.1.	<i>Use Case Flow Requirements</i>	29
8.2.2.	<i>Detailed Requirements</i>	30
8.3.	<i>Directory Services</i>	32
8.3.1.	<i>Use Case Flow Requirements</i>	32
8.3.2.	<i>Detailed Requirements</i>	32
8.4.	<i>Security and Transport</i>	32
8.4.1.	<i>Use Case Flow Requirements</i>	32
8.4.2.	<i>Referenced Specifications</i>	33
8.4.3.	<i>Technical Trust</i>	33
8.4.4.	<i>Digital Signatures</i>	34
8.4.5.	<i>Reporting Access Denials</i>	34
8.5.	<i>Patient Discovery</i>	35
8.5.1.	<i>Use Case Flow Requirements</i>	35
8.5.2.	<i>Detailed Requirements</i>	36
8.6.	<i>Record Locator Services</i>	38
8.6.1.	<i>Use Case Flow Requirements</i>	38
8.6.2.	<i>Detailed Requirements</i>	38
8.7.	<i>Document Query and Retrieve</i>	39
8.7.1.	<i>Use Case Flow Requirements</i>	39
8.7.2.	<i>Detailed Requirements</i>	41
9.0	Issues and Questions	46
9.1.	<i>Open Issues and Questions</i>	46
9.2.	<i>Resolved Issues and Questions</i>	48

1.0 Introduction

This Implementation Guide outlines policy, technical, and process requirements for Implementers of the Carequality Query-Based Document Exchange Use Case, under the terms of the Carequality Connected Agreement (CCA), and their Directory Sub-Entries (DSEs), under the Directory Sub-Entry Terms.

The Query-Based Document Exchange Use Case addresses the need for documents containing relevant healthcare information to be available upon request to appropriate parties across the healthcare ecosystem. A hospital may need information held by a primary care physician, who in turn may need information from a specialist or emergency department. A payer may need information from any of these clinical settings. Government agencies may need information from private sector organizations.

This Implementation Guide provides for flexibility across multiple query purposes and healthcare settings. Queries for treatment purposes have some additional requirements, but widespread exchange over a number of permitted purposes is envisioned.

In order to facilitate such widespread exchange, with a very large number of potential exchange partners, record location services will likely play an important role. It will not be practical for an end user, or even a system through an automated process, to query all of the accessible organizations to determine which of them may have information about a patient. Record locator services can pinpoint specific targets for queries. To maintain flexibility, however, a record locator service is not assumed or required.

As noted above, this Guide covers technical specifications as well as policy and process requirements. Sections 2 through 6 outline the policy and process requirements, while Sections 7 and 8 outline technical specifications.

2.0 Definition of Roles

The concept of a role within the use case is central to this Implementation Guide and to defining the rights, obligations, and responsibilities of Carequality Implementers and Directory Sub-Entries (DSEs). Implementers and Directory Sub-Entries play a declared role or roles, and Implementers must indicate to Carequality, during the application process for each use case, which role or roles the Implementer will fill, and which role or roles each of its DSEs fill.

By default, any requirement specified in Sections 3 through 6 of this Guide applies to any Implementer or DSE regardless of role. Requirements that apply only to those Implementers or DSEs with a particular role or roles will clearly indicate the role or roles to which they apply.

An Implementer may fill different roles than its DSEs, or may not actually fill any role at all. For example, an Implementer may provide network support, services, and oversight but play no direct role in the transactions specified for this Use Case.

2.1. Query Initiator

An Implementer or DSE with the declared role of a Query Initiator perform queries to retrieve information held by Implementers or DSEs in the Query Responder role. These queries may or may not be facilitated by an Implementer in the Record Locator Service role.

An Implementer or DSE with the declared role of a Query Initiator shall support the technical actor(s) specified in Section 8.1.1 of this Guide, and comply with any other requirements throughout this Guide that are specifically described as applying to the Query Initiator role.

2.2. Query Responder

An Implementer or DSE with the declared role of a Query Responder provides information in response to queries by Implementers or DSEs in the Query Initiator role.

Query Responders do not have direct interaction with Implementers in the Record Locator Service role, within the context of activities subject to the requirements of this Implementation Guide. Query Responders may have relationships with Implementers in the Record Locator Service role to, for example, provide data used by the Record Locator Service in the provision of its service to Query Initiators, but such a relationship is outside the scope of this Carequality Use Case and is not subject to this Implementation Guide.

An Implementer or DSE with the declared role of a Query Responder shall support the technical actor(s) specified in Section 8.1.2 of this Guide, and comply with any other requirements throughout this Guide that are specifically described as applying to the Query Responder role.

2.3. Record Locator Service (RLS)

An Implementer or DSE with the declared role of an RLS provides, in response to queries by Implementers or DSEs in the Query Initiator role, a list of Implementers and/or DSEs in the Query Responder role who potentially have, likely have, or are known to have records for the person who is the subject of the query.

An Implementer in the RLS role may have DSEs in other roles, even if the Implementer itself only plays the RLS role. Query Initiators must be able to query DSEs in the Query Responder role directly, through the transactions supported by the Query Responder role, without the use of an Implementer or other DSE's RLS being required. Similarly, an Implementer or DSE that has itself declared both the RLS and Query Responder roles must accept queries in its role as a Query Responder from Implementers and DSEs in the Query Initiator role who have chosen not to take advantage of the Implementer's or DSE's RLS function.

An Implementer or DSE with the declared role of an RLS shall support the technical actor(s) specified in Section 8.1.3 of this Guide, and comply with any other requirements throughout this Guide that are specifically described as applying to the RLS role.

3.0 Customizable Principles of Trust

3.1. Permitted Purposes

Carequality Implementers and DSEs represent a diverse set of stakeholders that wish to exchange health information for a variety of reasons. It is important to building trust that a common set of reasons to initiate a query for information (Permitted Purposes) be agreed to by all Implementers of this Use Case, and their DSEs. The Permitted Purposes for queries to be made under this Use Case are:

- Treatment
- Payment
- Health Care Operations
- Public Health Activities
- Authorization based disclosures

Each term is used as defined in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (“HIPAA”) and its implementing regulations, 45 C.F.R. Part 160 and 45 C.F.R. Part 164, Subparts A and E, *Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information*, and 45 C.F.R. Part 164, Subpart C, *Security Standards for the Protection of Electronic Protected Health Information*. Public Health Activities are those permitted pursuant to 45 C.F.R. Part 164.512(b).

Not every Implementer will support all of the Permitted Purposes allowed for the Query Use Case. Therefore, each Implementer shall identify to Carequality the Permitted Purposes that it and each of its DSEs support.

When an Implementer or DSE initiates a query for information, it shall clearly identify the specific Permitted Purpose for the query in the SAML token for the message, according to the NHIN Authorization Framework 3.0 specification, section 3.2.2.6, Purpose Of Use Attribute, as referenced in Section 8.4.2 of this Guide.

Note that the Permitted Purposes allowed for Carequality are a subset of those defined in the NHIN Authorization Framework.

3.2. Full Participation

It is important that all Implementers, DSEs and their End Users understand that others are committed to participate in this Use Case so that all those who participate can realize value for their investment of time and resources.

If an Implementer declares the role of Query Responder for this Use Case, as defined in Section 2 of this Guide, then it must provide information in response to valid queries for treatment unless doing so would violate applicable law or the Implementer’s local access policies. This obligation also applies to that Implementer’s DSEs. An Implementer may provide information in response to queries for other Permitted Purposes but is not required to do so.

An Implementer is not permitted to serve ONLY in the role of Query Initiator for the Permitted Purpose of treatment. An Implementer who wishes to be a Query Initiator for treatment purposes must also play the role of Query Responder for treatment purposes.

3.3. Permitted Users

No specific Permitted Users have been defined for this Use Case at this time. Carequality does not want to create restrictions on Implementers with respect to the querying workflow in their organizations, and those of their DSEs, for how they accomplish one of the Permitted Purposes.

3.4. Data Sufficiency and Integrity

It is clear to all stakeholders that the health information stored in EHRs would be more easily transacted over data sharing networks if the information was better structured into universally accepted formats. As of 2015, these formats do not exist or, if they exist, they are not universally accepted. The clear goal of Carequality is to make progress toward greater structure over time. While that work is being done, Implementers that are Query Responders are allowed to decide whether they share information that the Implementer, or its DSEs, has not yet confirmed as being accurate or clinically relevant. Some refer to the process of confirming the accuracy or clinical relevance of information as “vetting”. An Implementer that is a Query Responder may choose not to share with Query Initiators information that has not been vetted.

A Query Responder that does respond to a query with information will assure that whatever information is sent is an accurate representation of the information contained in the responding system.

3.5. Service Level Agreements

No Service Level Agreements (SLAs) have been identified for this Use Case at this time. Carequality will collect information from Implementers about system uptime, endpoint availability, and response time. This information will be used to determine what, if any, SLAs should be developed.

3.6. Customizable Flow-downs

No additional customizable flow-downs have been identified for this Use Case.

4.0 Non-Discrimination

Interoperability is impaired if organizations are free to impose whatever terms they choose as a condition of exchanging information. All Carequality Implementers and DSEs that choose to participate in a Use Case will do so without imposing unfair or unreasonable conditions that would limit exchange or interoperability with other Carequality Implementers and DSEs that are similarly situated. A condition is unfair or unreasonable if it results in similarly situated Implementers, or their DSEs, being treated differently. Whether two Implementers or DSEs are similarly situated is determined primarily by two factors: the purpose for which the information is being exchanged and the role that an Implementer or DSE plays as more specifically described below.

4.1. Treatment

Implementers and DSEs cannot impose any additional fees, terms or conditions on other Implementers or DSEs with respect to queries or responses for treatment purposes. In order to conform to the Full Participation requirement of this Implementation Guide, queries for the Permitted Purpose of treatment must be honored by those in the Query Responder role without imposing any additional fees or other terms. No additional agreements beyond the Carequality legal framework may be required. The type of organization initiating the query is not a factor (although organizations claiming treatment must actually be providing treatment, or be making the request on behalf of a network member that is providing treatment).

4.2. Other Permitted Purposes

Implementers and DSEs are permitted, but not required, to impose fees, terms and conditions on other Implementers or DSEs with respect to queries or responses for any permitted purpose other than treatment. Any fees, terms and conditions must comply with Section 4.3 of this Implementation Guide.

Implementers that play the role of Query Responder are not required to honor queries for non-treatment permitted purposes. However, Query Responders may choose to honor queries for other permitted purposes. If a Query Responder does choose to honor queries for a non-treatment purpose, it must honor queries for that permitted purpose from all Query Initiators, unless (i) to do so would violate applicable law; (ii) it has chosen to honor queries only from particular government agencies as further outlined in Section 4.3; or (iii) it has chosen to impose terms and conditions on Query Initiators, and has not reached agreement on such terms and conditions with a particular Query Initiator, as further described in Section 4.3.

4.3. Consistency in Additional Terms and Conditions

If an Implementer or DSE chooses to impose additional terms and conditions on other Implementers and DSEs with respect to performing or responding to queries for permitted purposes other than treatment, such terms and conditions cannot vary based on the type of organization that the other Implementer or DSE is. For example, a Query Responder cannot impose one set of conditions on health care providers and another set of conditions on health care payers for queries based on the same permitted purpose. However, it is acceptable for a Query Responder to treat local, state or federal government agencies differently from other Implementers and DSEs. For example, a Query Responder can choose to respond to queries for payment from CMS but not from commercial insurers. Also, a Query Responder may accept a fee for providing information in response to a query from the Social Security Administration without charging a fee to other Query Initiators.

Except as noted above with respect to government agencies, additional terms and conditions must be imposed consistently on all other Implementers and DSEs that perform or respond to queries for the same Permitted Purpose.

An Implementer or DSE may impose different fees on different Implementers and DSEs, but the differences should be based on a consistently-applied set of objective, economically relevant criteria such as organization size or transaction volume.

If an Implementer or DSE offers particular terms to one party, it must make good faith efforts to reach similar terms with other parties who perform or respond to queries for the same Permitted Purpose, subject to the exception for government agencies noted above. If a party feels that good faith efforts to reach terms are not being made, it may file a grievance under the Carequality Grievance Process.

4.4. Record Locator Services

A Record Locator Service provides a value-added service that makes querying for records easier and more efficient, but is not required in order to obtain records since the record holder can be queried directly. A Record Locator Service provides the locations of patient records, but does not provide the records themselves or the clinical data they contain, which are requested from an Implementer or DSE in the Query Responder role based on the locations reported by the Record Locator Service.

A Record Locator Service for purposes of the Query-Based Document Exchange Use Case is narrowly defined in Section 2.3, and is distinguished primarily by being a Responding Gateway actor for the ITI-56 Patient Location Query transaction. Full details may be found in Section 8.1.3 below.

An Implementer or DSE that is a Record Locator Service may honor patient location queries selectively based on additional agreements and charge a fee, including for patient location queries that are for treatment.

5.0 Performance Measures

In order to gauge Carequality's success in advancing widespread interoperability, Carequality will collect information from Implementers on a number of performance measures. These measures are meant to measure the impact of Carequality and specifically of this Use Case, not to evaluate individual Implementers, and the measures themselves will have no impact on an Implementer's Carequality Connected status.

Carequality will request, on a periodic basis but no more than twice per calendar year, that Implementers provide a report on the measures outlined in this section. Implementers are required to respond for each measure with:

1. Information for that measure that is correct to the best of the Implementers' knowledge,
2. An attestation that the particular measure does not apply to that Implementer, or
3. An attestation that the Implementer cannot discover the information for that measure through commercially reasonable efforts.

5.1. Acceleration

This category addresses Carequality's effectiveness in accelerating the process of establishing connections. In this category, Carequality will have a single measure: Time in days from an

Implementer's signing of the Carequality Connected Agreement, to production go-live by that Implementer or at least one DSE, in at least one role specified for this Use Case.

Since the information needed for this measure will already be available to Carequality, no reporting from Implementers is necessary. This measure is included here simply for completeness.

5.2. Seamless Connectivity

This category addresses Carequality's effectiveness in broadening the scope of connectivity. There are several measures in this category, encompassing the breadth and scale of Implementers' connectivity as well as the adoption of that connectivity.

5.2.1. Breadth and Scale

1. Number of end users in production sharing information through the Implementer's network, service, or operations.
2. Types of member organizations or facilities making up the Implementer's network, or using its services. Note that these members do not all have to be DSEs to be reported here, as long as they are able to take advantage of the Implementer's Carequality Connected status. (For example, hospitals, clinics, mental health centers, long term care centers, etc.)
3. Geographic areas represented by those member organizations.
4. Number of unique end users connected through the Implementer's network, service, or operations.

5.2.2. Adoption and Volume

1. Annual number of document queries performed through the Implementer's network, service, or operations.
2. If applicable: number of unique individuals included in the Implementer's master person index.

5.3. Interoperable Exchange

This category addresses Carequality's impact on the effectiveness and depth of connectivity, and focus on the capabilities and resiliency of each Implementer's operations.

1. Document types available to requesters through the Implementer or its DSEs.
2. Percent uptime for the Implementer's operations (if measurable to the extent that the Implementer's network, service, or operations rely on a centralized architecture maintained by the Implementer).
3. Average response time for requests made to the Implementer or its DSEs.

6.0 Evidence of Compliance

Applicants wishing to become Implementers of this Use Case must show evidence that they are able to comply with the requirements of the Use Case. These requirements fall broadly into two categories:

1. The Carequality Application Process as defined for all Implementers, regardless of Use Case.

2. Compliance of the Implementer's system(s) with the technical specifications of the role or roles that it or its DSEs will play, or in the case of ongoing connectivity verification, do play.

6.1. Application Process

This Guide does not add any requirements or additional steps beyond the Carequality Application Process defined for all Implementers and enforced by the Carequality Connected Agreement.

6.2. Technical Testing and Ongoing Verification

This section outlines the steps that Implementers must take in order to provide confidence that their network can connect to those of other Implementers using the technical specifications for this Use Case. The primary focus of technical testing for Carequality is on production system connectivity. Sections 6.2.2 through 6.2.4 apply to Implementers declaring the Query Initiator and/or Query Responder role, either for themselves or their DSEs. These sections do not apply to those Implementers who are only in the Record Locator Service role, although such Implementers are encouraged to perform similar tests with those who will use their service.

When considering this connectivity validation approach, it is necessary to distinguish between two important but separate goals.

- 1) Providing reasonable confidence in the overall ability of a network to connect to others via the specifications for this Use Case.
- 2) Maintaining surveillance of connectivity for individual participants at all levels, including DSEs.

The latter is an important topic, but is not the subject of this process, which is intended only to provide reasonable confidence in an Implementer's own systems as well as its network of DSEs taken as a whole.

Nonetheless, Implementers do have a responsibility to validate that their DSEs are consistently able to connect with other Implementers and DSEs. It is unreasonable to expect that every DSE will be accessible at all times to every other Implementer and DSE, but if a DSE is consistently inaccessible to other Implementers and/or their DSEs, the Implementer must work with that DSE to resolve its connectivity or suspend its status as a DSE.

If an Implementer or DSE is persistently inaccessible but does not voluntarily suspend its status as an Implementer or DSE, and another Implementer believes that productive efforts are not being made to resolve the connectivity, a grievance may be filed under the Carequality Grievance Process.

The testing and connectivity validation approach outlined in Sections 6.2.2 through 6.2.4 relies on Implementers serving as testing and validation partners for other Implementers. All Implementers who play, or support DSEs who play, the Query Initiator and/or Query Responder roles have an obligation to serve as testing and validation partners at the reasonable request of other Implementers or Carequality on behalf of other Implementers. Implementers are strongly encouraged to coordinate with one another to distribute the effort of serving as testing and validation partners evenly among the community of Implementers.

6.2.1. Assertion of Compliance

By declaring the intent for itself and its DSEs to play a role or roles in this Use Case, and beginning the Technical Testing process outlined in Sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.3, an Implementer asserts that the system or systems used to play the declared role or roles are compliant with the technical specifications for the declared role or roles, as outlined in Sections 7.0 and 8.0 of this Guide.

Implementers are encouraged to take advantage of testing opportunities such as tools provided by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), testing platforms maintained by private organizations, and Integrating the Healthcare Enterprise (IHE) Connectathon events.

6.2.2. Non-Production Partner Test

Prior to implementing production connectivity via the transactions specified for this Use Case, each Implementer will complete a non-production test with one other Implementer whose connectivity relies on software provided by a different technology vendor or provider (the Test Partner). Implementers who themselves do not play a role in this Use Case may designate a DSE to perform the test, or perform the test using an internal environment as long as that environment has the same code base that will be delivered to the Implementer's DSEs.

The non-production partner test will consist of successful execution of each transaction required for the role or roles declared by the Implementer as being played either directly by that Implementer or by its DSEs. The success of the test will be at the discretion of the Test Partner, but Test Partners should not report success unless each transaction has been completed and data returned to the other party in that transaction. Specifically, matching patients must be found, at least one document must be available, and one or more documents must be retrieved. Data should be coordinated among the test partners such that patient matching is successful.

Upon completion of the test to the Test Partner's satisfaction, the Test Partner will independently inform Carequality that the Implementer's non-production partner test was successfully completed.

Implementers who themselves do not play a role in this Use Case may serve as Test Partners for other Implementers, either by designating a DSE to perform the transactions or by using an internal environment as long as that environment has the same code base that will be delivered to the Implementer's DSEs. In such cases, the Implementer serving as the Test Partner will itself inform Carequality of the test's successful completion, even if a DSE performs the transactions on the Test Partner's behalf.

6.2.3. Production Connectivity Validation – Pre-Live

After completing the non-production partner test and meeting the applicable requirements of the Carequality Application Process, an Implementer may configure its production system for connectivity via the transactions specified for this Use Case. Prior to being publicized as a live Implementer of this Use Case, the Implementer must complete connectivity validation in production. Implementers who themselves do not play a role in this Use Case must designate at least three DSEs to individually perform the connectivity validation. In such a case, the designated DSEs will each perform every step below that

is described as required of the Implementer. The Implementer, however, will compile the results from all DSEs and submit a single report to Carequality.

The connectivity validation will consist of two steps. In the first step, basic connectivity is confirmed through Patient Discovery transactions. Implementers in the Query Initiator role, or who support DSEs in the Query Initiator role, must perform a Patient Discovery transaction to at least four other Implementers, of which at least 75% must return a “No Matching Patient Found” response rather than no response or an error. If fewer than four other Implementers exist, the Patient Discovery transaction must be sent to all other Implementers, and all must be successful. Sending the Patient Discovery transaction successfully, i.e. with the result of “No Matching Patient Found”, to three DSEs of an Implementer that does not itself play a Query Responder role, but supports that role for its DSEs, will serve as successfully querying that Implementer.

Implementers in the Query Responder role, or who support DSEs in the Query Responder role, must receive Patient Discovery transactions from at least four other Implementers, and must respond successfully with a “No Matching Patient Found” response for at least 75% of these transactions. Such a response is “successful” if it is received and processed without error by the querying system. If fewer than four other Implementers exist, the Patient Discovery transaction must be received from all other Implementers, with all other Implementers receiving a successful response as defined above.

Upon completion of this test, the Implementer must provide to Carequality a list of the other Implementers involved and the outcome of the query, namely, (1) “No Matching Patient Found”, (2) an error, or (3) no response. Carequality may corroborate the reported results with some or all of the other Implementers with whom connectivity testing occurred.

If more than eight other Implementers exist, the connectivity test must be performed with at least half of the other Implementers, rounding up when there are odd numbers of Implementers. Connectivity must still be successful with 75% of the other Implementers, again rounding up if 75% is not an integer. For example, if there are nine other Implementers, an Implementer must perform the connectivity test with at least five of them. If the test is performed with five other Implementers, at least four must be successful.

It is anticipated that many systems will automatically assign a particular Permitted Purpose when performing a query, based on the workflow from which the query originates. Therefore, an Implementer or its designated DSEs may claim any Permitted Purpose within the transactions used for the connectivity test, including Treatment, as long as: (i) the patient record used in the transaction is a dummy record deliberately constructed so that it is reasonably expected not to match legitimate patient records; and (ii) the Implementer or DSE is acting in good faith to perform a test as required by this Implementation Guide and is not knowingly attempting to access data for a real patient. A grievance may not be filed under the Carequality Grievance Process if it is based solely on the fact that test transactions performed under this validation process do not actually conform to their stated Permitted Purpose.

While general experience shows that receiving the “No Matching Patient Found” response for a dummy patient is a reasonable method for establishing that connectivity will likely be successful between two parties, it does not guarantee that there is not a configuration issue related to the other required transactions. Therefore, all Implementers in the Query Responder and Query Initiator roles must complete testing with a Production Validation Partner. An Implementer must coordinate data with its Production Validation Partner such that connectivity can be confirmed for all required transactions for that Implementer’s role or roles.

The Production Validation Partner may be the same as the Test Partner, and, like the Test Partner, must be an Implementer whose connectivity relies on software provided by a different technology vendor or provider. The DSEs performing the validation steps on behalf of Implementers who themselves do not play a role may use the same Production Validation Partner as each other, or may choose different Production Validation Partners. Query Initiators must demonstrate that they are able to retrieve data successfully from the Production Validation Partner, while Query Responders must demonstrate that the Production Validation Partner is able to retrieve data successfully from them. Implementers are strongly encouraged to perform the validation with their Production Validation Partner using coordinated dummy patient data, but if it is not possible to do so under policy constraints on dummy data in production, appropriate authorization can be obtained to perform queries for an actual shared patient.

Upon completion of the validation to the Production Validation Partner’s satisfaction, the Production Validation Partner will independently inform Carequality that the Implementer’s production partner validation was successfully completed.

6.2.4. Production Connectivity Validation – Ongoing

Initial testing at first live use does not guarantee ongoing connectivity, as systems and networks evolve over time. On a quarterly basis, all Implementers in the Query Initiator and Query Responder roles must repeat the initial connectivity testing step of sending or receiving the Patient Discovery query with at least four other Implementers, of which at least 75% must be successful as defined in Section 6.2.3. If fewer than four other Implementers exist, the Patient Discovery transaction must be completed successfully with all other Implementers. Sending the Patient Discovery transaction successfully, i.e. with the result of “No Matching Patient Found”, to three DSEs of an Implementer that does not itself play a Query Responder role, but supports that role for its DSEs, will serve as successfully querying that Implementer. As with the pre-live connectivity validation, Implementers who themselves do not play a role in the Use Case must designate at least three DSEs to perform the validation steps. Such Implementers are strongly encouraged to designate different DSEs for each quarterly validation. Implementers are also encouraged to query every Implementer and individual DSE that has its own endpoints, if this can be done without an undo operational burden.

In order to balance the need to monitor connectivity with the need to prevent this ongoing validation from presenting a burden to Implementers, the requirement to test with at least four other Implementers applies regardless of the total number of other Implementers.

If the Implementer cannot successfully connect with at least 75% of those queried, the Implementer must investigate the circumstances behind the communications failures, take such steps as are necessary to resolve the issues, and perform the test again.

If three months pass since the previous successful connectivity test with at least 75% of the Implementers queried, and the Implementer is not able to execute a successful test, it must report that failure to Carequality, and will develop with Carequality a plan for restoring connectivity within 30 days or will suspend its participation in this Use Case until it is able to successfully perform the testing required of a new Implementer in Section 6.2.3.

Upon completion of a successful test, the Implementer must provide to Carequality a list of the other Implementers involved and the outcome of the query, namely, (1) "No Matching Patient Found", (2) an error, or (3) no response.

7.0 Query-Based Document Exchange Use Case

7.1. Background

This use case describes the actors, transactions, and requirements to enable the exchange of health information between and among networks for simple query. The use case focuses on desired functionality, i.e. the user goals and how system actors meet them, highlighting the information that flows and the variations allowed by the existing specifications. Non-functional considerations such as security are minimized here for readability and covered in section 8.4.

The use case is written to enumerate all flows (both alternate and error) that are possible, given the underlying transactions. The decisions regarding which flows are considered in and out of scope for Carequality are made in section 9, Technical Requirements and Guidance.

7.2. Use Case: Query Systems For Patient Information (XCPD/XCA)

In this use case, a user (acting through an Initiating Gateway) queries Responding Gateways for patient clinical information, using the IHE XCPD and XCA profiles.

7.2.1. Actors

1. Initiating Gateway (multiplicity of 1)
2. Responding Gateway (multiplicity of 1..*).
3. Participant Gateway Directory, i.e. phonebook (e.g. HPD, UDDI or other) (multiplicity of 0..*)
4. Record Locator Service (multiplicity of 0..*)

7.2.2. Assumptions

1. The Initiating Gateway and Responding Gateway agree on transport level details (specified elsewhere in this document) that allow for the following:
 - a. Secure messaging over TLS.
 - b. The ability of the Initiating Gateway (and the Responding Gateway, in the case of deferred responses) to send information in each message that identifies security and

permission details about the request such as: who is requesting, what their role is, and what their purpose is.

- c. The ability of the Responding Gateway (and the Initiating Gateway, in the case of deferred responses) to choose if/how to allow the transaction to proceed based on this information and its own business rules.

7.2.3. Pre-conditions

1. The Initiating Gateway knows the patient's demographics.
2. (Nominal flow only) The Initiating Gateway has the desired service endpoint(s), and optionally the HCIDs, for some number of Responding Gateways that may be queried for patient information.

7.2.4. Use Case Steps – “Nominal Flow”

1. This use case begins when the Initiating Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Patient Discovery [ITI-55] request to a Responding Gateway to attempt to match a patient by demographics. The request includes patient demographics (e.g. name, gender, date of birth) as known by the Initiating Gateway. See IHE ITI TF-1: 27 XCPD Integration Profile and IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.
2. The Responding Gateway compares the demographics to its known patients, applying its own algorithm to determine matches, and returns an IHE Cross Gateway Patient Discovery [ITI-55] response to the Initiating Gateway. The response contains a single patient match, including demographics and patient ID as known by the Responding Gateway. Each match (i.e. RegistrationEvent) includes the code NotHealthDataLocator to indicate that the corresponding community does not maintain externally available location information about this patient. See IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.4.2.2.5 Specifying support as a Health Data Locator.
3. The Initiating Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Query [ITI-38] “FindDocuments” request to the Responding Gateway to query for document entries for this patient. “FindDocuments” refers to the fact that the ITI-38 request has multiple flavors, known as stored queries, such as FindFolders and GetAssociations. FindDocuments is the most basic query. The query includes a number of parameters, which restrict the set from all document entries available for the patient. The minimum required parameters for FindDocuments are the patient ID at the Responding Gateway and the status of the document entries to return, typically urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep:StatusType:Approved. Approved in this context means the document is available for patient care. In addition, the Initiating Gateway specifies a returnType parameter value of LeafClass, which means to return full metadata contents. See IHE ITI TF-1: 18 Cross-Community Access (XCA) Integration Profile, IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38, and IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.
4. The Responding Gateway filters its known documents by the query parameters passed in and returns an ITI-38 response containing a number of document entries. In the document entry is a tuple of IDs (Home Community ID, Repository ID, and Document unique ID) that enable an Initiating Gateway to later retrieve the actual document. See IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.1.1 DocumentEntry.
5. The Initiating Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Retrieve [ITI-39] request to the Responding Gateway to retrieve documents. The request includes the document/repository/community IDs

at the Responding Gateway. See IHE ITI TF-1: 18 Cross-Community Access (XCA) Integration Profile, IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.39, and IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.43.

6. The Responding Gateway retrieves the requested documents from its repositories and returns an ITI-39 response containing the documents and their related IDs.
7. If the Initiating Gateway has more Responding Gateways to query and wishes to do so, it may, returning to step 1.

7.2.5. Post-conditions

1. The Initiating Gateway has correlated its local patient ID and demographics to the patient ID and demographics as known by each Responding Gateway that returned a patient match that was confirmed by the Initiating Gateway. Left unspecified is whether the IG has persisted this correlation for later use beyond the completed workflow.
2. The Initiating Gateway has obtained the desired document entries as known by each Responding Gateway.
3. The Initiating Gateway has obtained the desired documents from each Responding Gateway.

7.2.6. Alternate Flows

1. Find Service Endpoint by HCID
 - a. Prior to step 1, 3, or 5, the Initiating Gateway has the HCID of the community it wishes to query, but does not have the web services endpoint.
 - b. The Initiating Gateway queries a Participant Gateway Directory for the endpoint of the desired service, passing the HCID.
 - i. Note that there may be multiple ways to perform this query: pull everything about a HCID; first get business info then pull endpoints via separate queries, etc. Details of the querying are not specified.
 - c. The Participant Gateway Directory returns the requested service endpoint for the Responding Gateway.
 - d. The use case continues.
2. Find Service Endpoint by search parameters
 - a. Prior to step 1, 3, or 5, the Initiating Gateway knows some information about the location at which the patient has been seen, but does not have the HCID of the community it wishes to query, nor the web services endpoint.
 - b. The Initiating Gateway queries a Participant Gateway Directory for the endpoint of the desired service, passing search parameters such as: name and location of the healthcare facility, geographic area, provider specialty, provider name, use cases or profiles supported.
 - i. Note that this is distinct from an RLS use case in that it uses “top-down” searching for patient data locations based on what is known by the Initiating Gateway, not “bottom-up” searching based on patient data locations explicitly known by an RLS service.
 - ii. Note that there may be multiple ways to perform this query: pull everything about a HCID; first get business info then pull endpoints via separate queries, etc. Details of the querying are not specified.
 - c. The Participant Gateway Directory returns the requested HCID and service endpoint for the Responding Gateway.
 - d. The use case continues.


3. Find Service Endpoint by external directory
 - a. In any of the “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows, rather than communicating with a web services based Participant Gateway Directory, the Initiating Gateway utilizes an external directory (e.g. a web-based, human-readable directory) to obtain equivalent information.
 - b. The use case continues.
4. Find Service Endpoint – multiple Responding Gateways found
 - a. In any of the “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows, the Participant Gateway Directory returns multiple Responding Gateways.
 - b. The Initiating Gateway may attempt to further filter the Responding Gateways, for example, by presenting the responses to the patient, or may simply use all Responding Gateways found for the Query use case.
 - c. The use case continues.
5. Use of directory to obtain information other than Responding Gateway endpoints
 - a. In any of the “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows, the Initiating Gateway queries a Participant Gateway Directory or external directory for information other than Responding Gateway endpoints, for example: use cases or profiles supported, internal organizations, levels of assurance.
 - b. The use case continues.
6. Demographic Query and Feed mode
 - a. In step 1, the ITI-55 request includes at least one patient ID as known by the Initiating Gateway, as well as an indication of which Assigning Authority ID to use in the event there is more than one patient ID. See IHE ITI TF-1: 27 XCPD Integration Profile and IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.4.1.2.4 Values used by Responding Gateway for a reverse Cross Gateway Query. The use case continues.
 - b. Post-Condition (additional): The Responding Gateway may have persisted the correlation between its local patient ID and demographics and the patient ID and demographics as known by the Initiating Gateway. This allows the Responding Gateway, if paired with an Initiating Gateway, to execute this use case in reverse and skip steps 1 and 2.
 - c. Note: in this case, both gateways have both sets of patient IDs and demographics, but they may have slightly different patient matching algorithms, so it is possible for one gateway to consider this a match and the other not to.
7. Known third party patient identifier
 - a. Background: The nominal use of the patient ID [Assigning Authority ID + unique ID] is as an opaque identifier from the perspective of the Initiating Gateway.
 - b. In step 2 (or in alternate flow “Demographic Query and Feed mode”), the AAID is from a third party known to the Initiating Gateway, and the patient identifier is known or knowable to the Initiating Gateway through other means. Use of these third party identifiers can greatly increase the degree of confidence of a patient match. The use case continues.
8. Ambiguous match may be resolved with more demographics
 - a. In step 2, the Responding Gateway cannot make a conclusive match, but may be able to if the Initiating Gateway provides additional demographics. The Responding Gateway returns a special error code indicating which specific demographics would help resolve the ambiguity. The Initiating Gateway chooses to execute one of the following subflows:
 - i. Subflow 1: The Initiating Gateway repeats step 1, passing the additional demographics. The use case continues.

- ii. Subflow 2: The Initiating Gateway declines to pass additional demographics, perhaps due to privacy concerns. The use case continues at step 7.
- b. See IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.4.2.2.6 Special handling for more attributes requested, and 3.55.4.2.3 Expected Actions, Case 3.
- 9. Multiple matches returned within a given HCID
 - a. In step 2, the Responding Gateway returns multiple patient matches (i.e. multiple RegistrationEvents) with the same HCID. See IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.4.2.3 Expected Actions, Case 2, and 3.55.4.2.2.4 Specifying homeCommunityId in Response. This implies the patient matched multiple records at the Responding system, each of which pertains to a distinct patient. The Initiating Gateway chooses to execute one of the following subflows.
 - i. Subflow 1: The Initiating Gateway attempts to resolve the patient match by comparing the demographics returned to its own. If it can resolve to one record, it continues to step 3. If not, the use case continues at step 7.
 - ii. Subflow 2: If policy permits, the Initiating Gateway continues with step 3 for each patient ID, and once all documents have been retrieved, attempts to disambiguate based on document content.
 - iii. Subflow 3: The Initiating Gateway abandons the attempt to match the patient. The use case continues at step 7.
- 10. Multiple matches returned with different HCIDs
 - a. In step 2, the Responding Gateway returns multiple patient matches (i.e. multiple RegistrationEvents) with different HCIDs. This implies the patient was successfully matched, but has data under multiple patient records (e.g. at different facilities). See IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.4.2.2.4 Specifying homeCommunityId in Response.
 - b. The Initiating Gateway resolves the HCIDs to endpoints, executing the “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows if needed, and will use these endpoints later in step 3.
 - c. The use case continues with step 3 for each patient ID.
- 11. Asynchronous patient discovery
 - a. In step 1, the Initiating Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Patient Discovery request asynchronously. The request includes the endpoint to send the response to. The request returns immediately.
 - b. In step 2, the Responding Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Patient Discovery response asynchronously.
 - c. The use case continues.
- 12. Deferred patient discovery
 - a. In step 1, the Initiating Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Patient Discovery request using the deferred mechanism.
 - b. The Responding Gateway stores the request for later processing and returns an acknowledgement message immediately.
 - c. The Responding Gateway resolves the Initiating Gateway’s HCID to the deferred response endpoint, executing a “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flow if needed.
 - d. In step 2, the Responding Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Patient Discovery response using the deferred mechanism. The response uses WS-Addressing RelatesTo and the XCPD QueryId to link back to the original request at both the transport and application layers respectively.
 - e. The Initiating Gateway returns an acknowledgement message.
 - f. The use case continues.
- 13. Health data locators returned

Commented [A1]: See open question QUERY-001.

Commented [A2]: See open question QUERY-001.

- a. In step 2, within one or more RegistrationEvents, the Responding Gateway returns the code SupportsHealthDataLocator. This indicates that the community identified by the Home Community ID in that RegistrationEvent is a Health Data Locator for this patient (aka a Record Locator Service).
 - b. For each community identified as a Health Data Locator for this patient, the Initiating Gateway may execute the following subflow:
 - i. The Initiating Gateway resolves the HCID to an endpoint, executing a “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flow if needed.
 - ii. The Initiating Gateway sends an IHE Patient Location Query [ITI-56] request to the Responding Gateway to find communities where this patient may have healthcare data. The request includes the patient identifier as known by the Responding Gateway. See IHE ITI TF-1: 27 XCPD Integration Profile and IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.56 (some content is currently found in the XCPD Health Data Locator and Revoke Option supplement).
 - iii. The Responding Gateway returns an ITI-56 response to the Initiating Gateway. The response contains some number of patient identifiers, each with a corresponding HCID.
 - iv. The Initiating Gateway resolves the HClDs to endpoints, executing the “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows if needed, and will use these endpoints later in step 3.
 - v. If the Initiating Gateway had previously obtained a list of potential communities to look for data for this patient through executing the “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows, the requesting user or system may choose to reduce that list based on these results.
 - vi. The use case continues with step 3 for each patient ID.
 - c. The use case continues.
14. Asynchronous patient location query
- a. In step b.ii of alternate flow “Health data locators returned”, the Initiating Gateway sends the Patient Location Query request asynchronously. The request includes the endpoint to send the response to. The request returns immediately.
 - b. In step b.iii, the Responding Gateway sends the Patient Location Query response asynchronously.
 - c. The use case continues.
15. Chunked document query
- a. Prior to step 3, the Initiating Gateway expects a large number of document entries.
 - b. In step 3, the Initiating Gateway passes a returnType value of ObjectRef, which means to return references to registry objects instead of the metadata-containing objects themselves. See IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.4.1.2.3.1 Parameter returnType.
 - c. In step 4, the Responding Gateway returns a list of matching object references.
 - d. The Initiating Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Query [ITI-38] request to the Responding Gateway with a stored query that takes object references, for example, GetDocuments. See IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.4.1.2.3.7 Parameters for Required Queries for other queries.
 - e. The Responding Gateway returns an ITI-38 response containing a number of registry objects.

- f. The Initiating Gateway continues to send similar requests until all desired registry objects have been retrieved.
 - g. The use case continues at step 5.
16. Advanced document queries 
- a. In step 3, the Initiating Gateway queries for patient clinical information using one of the other XCA/XDS.b stored queries, which allow traversal of the relational XDS.b model of clinical information about a patient. See IHE ITI TF-3: section 4 Metadata used in Document Sharing profiles (section titled "Cross-Transaction Specifications" in earlier versions of the IHE ITI TF), and IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.4.1.2.3.7 Parameters for Required Queries.
 - i. FindSubmissionSets – Find submission sets by filter parameters.
 - ii. FindFolders – Find folders by filter parameters.
 - iii. GetAll – Find document entries, submission sets, folders and associated document entries by filter parameters.
 - iv. GetDocuments – Get document entries by reference.
 - v. GetFolders – Get folders by reference.
 - vi. GetAssociations – Get associations by associated object reference.
 - vii. GetDocumentsAndAssociations – Get document entries and associations by reference.
 - viii. GetSubmissionSets – Get submission sets by reference.
 - ix. GetSubmissionSetAndContents – Get a submission set by reference, including all contained document entries, folders and associations.
 - x. GetFolderAndContents – Get a folder by reference, including all contained document entries and associations.
 - xi. GetFoldersForDocument – Get folders by document entry reference
 - xii. GetRelatedDocuments – Get document entries by related document entry reference
 - xiii. FindDocumentsByReferenceId - Find document entries by filter parameters, including a reference ID.
 - b. In step 4, the Responding Gateway returns an ITI-38 response containing the appropriate registry objects and/or object references.
 - c. The use case continues.
17. Query for deprecated documents
- a. In step 3, the Initiating Gateway queries for a document status of urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep:StatusType:Deprecated, which means to return historical document entries that have been superseded or are otherwise not considered valid for current clinical use.
 - b. In step 4, the Responding Gateway returns a set of deprecated documents.
 - c. The use case continues.
18. Document entries returned with different HCIDs
- a. In step 4, the Responding Gateway returns document entries with different HCIDs than that of the Responding Gateway itself. This is not currently permitted by the XCA profile, but the Initiating Gateway may choose to be flexible and handle it.
 - b. The Initiating Gateway chooses to execute one of the following subflows.
 - i. Subflow 1: The Initiating Gateway considers this an error. The use case continues at step 7.
 - ii. Subflow 2: The Initiating Gateway continues to use the same endpoint(s) for the Responding Gateway. The use case continues, and the Responding Gateway

Commented [A3]: See resolved question **QUERY-002**.

- successfully handles and routes subsequent messages containing these different HCIDs.
- iii. Subflow 3: The Initiating Gateway resolves the HCIDs to endpoints, executing the “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows if needed. The use case continues.
19. Query returns partial success
- a. In step 4, the Responding Gateway returns some but not all available document entries, along with the status `urn:ietf:2007:ResponseStatusType:PartialSuccess`, and some number of `RegistryError` elements.
 - b. The Initiating Gateway chooses to execute one of the following subflows.
 - i. Subflow 1: The Initiating Gateway determines that it still wants these documents, so it continues to step 5 with the received document entries.
 - ii. Subflow 2: The Initiating Gateway determines that it does not want to retrieve these documents. The use case resumes at step 7.
20. Asynchronous document query
- a. In step 3, the Initiating Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Query request asynchronously. The request includes the endpoint to send the response to. The request returns immediately.
 - b. In step 4, the Responding Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Query response asynchronously.
21. On-demand documents, initial query/retrieve
- a. Additional precondition: The Initiating Gateway and Responding Gateway support the On-Demand Documents option. See IHE ITI TF On-Demand Documents supplement, Vol 2b, 3.43.4.2.2 Message Semantics.
 - b. In step 3, the Initiating Gateway requests On-Demand document entries be included in the response via the `$XDSDocumentEntryType` query parameter.
 - c. In step 4, the Responding Gateway returns On-Demand document entries.
 - d. In step 5, the Initiating Gateway retrieves documents passing in On-Demand document entries, and may also pass stable document entries.
 - e. In step 6, for each On-Demand document entry, the Responding Gateway returns a document based on the latest information available for that patient and document entry. In addition to the document content, the Responding Gateway will return `NewDocumentUniqueId`. If the Responding Gateway returns `NewRepositoryUniqueId`, this indicates that the Responding Gateway supports the Persistence of Retrieved Documents Option, meaning it has persisted a stable document that is a snapshot in time and may be retrieved at a later time using these identifiers – see alternate flow “On-demand documents, retrieve persisted document after change in underlying data”.
 - f. The use case continues.
22. On-demand documents, retrieve after change in underlying data
- a. Additional precondition: the Initiating Gateway has previously retrieved an on-demand document entry, and since that time, the underlying patient data has been updated.
 - b. In step 5, the Initiating Gateway retrieves documents passing in On-Demand document entries, and may also pass stable document entries.
 - c. In step 6, for each On-Demand document entry, the Responding Gateway returns a new document containing the most recent snapshot of information for that patient. In addition to the document content, the Responding Gateway will return `NewDocumentUniqueId`. If the Responding Gateway returns `NewRepositoryUniqueId`, this indicates that the Responding Gateway supports the Persistence of Retrieved Documents Option, meaning it has persisted a stable document that is a snapshot in

- time and may be retrieved at a later time using these identifiers – see alternate flow “On-demand documents, retrieve persisted document after change in underlying data”.
- d. The use case continues.
23. On-demand documents, retrieve persisted document after change in underlying data
- a. Additional preconditions:
 - i. The Responding Gateway supports the Persistence of Retrieved Documents Option.
 - ii. The Initiating Gateway has previously retrieved an on-demand document entry and saved the returned NewDocumentUniqueId and NewRepositoryUniqueId.
 - iii. Since the initial retrieve, the underlying patient data has changed.
 - b. In step 5, the Initiating Gateway retrieves the persisted stable document passing in the saved NewDocumentUniqueId and NewRepositoryUniqueId, and may also pass On-Demand document entries.
 - c. In step 6, the Responding Gateway returns the previously persisted stable document, which matches what was previously retrieved exactly.
 - d. The use case continues.
24. Initiating Gateway begins with cached patient correlation
- a. Additional precondition: the Initiating Gateway has previously cached the correlation between its local patient identifier and the remote patient identifier at the Responding Gateway. This may have been obtained in one of the following ways:
 - i. The Initiating Gateway has completed step 2 of a previous instance of the use case.
 - ii. The Initiating Gateway has completed alternate flow “Demographic Query and Feed mode” of a previous instance of the use case as a Responding Gateway.
 - iii. The Initiating Gateway has obtained the remote patient identifier through out-of-band means.
 - b. The use case begins at step 3.
25. Retrieve returns partial success
- a. In step 6, the Responding Gateway returns some but not all requested documents, along with the status `urn:hl7-org:2007:ResponseStatusType:PartialSuccess`, and some number of RegistryError elements.
 - b. The use case continues.
26. Asynchronous document retrieve
- a. In step 5, the Initiating Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Retrieve request asynchronously. The request includes the endpoint to send the response to. The request returns immediately.
 - b. In step 6, the Responding Gateway sends the Cross Gateway Retrieve response asynchronously.
 - c. The use case continues.
27. Initiating Gateway begins with cached document entry
- a. Additional precondition: the Initiating Gateway has previously cached a document entry identifier at the Responding Gateway. This may have been obtained in one of the following ways:
 - i. The Initiating Gateway has completed step 4 of a previous instance of the use case.
 - ii. The Initiating Gateway has obtained the remote document entry identifier through out-of-band means.
 - b. The use case begins at step 5.

28. Responding Gateway retrieves consent document during Cross Gateway Patient Discovery transaction
- In step 1, the Initiating Gateway has included in its security information reference to consent document(s) applicable to this request.
 - The Responding Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Query [ITI-38] "FindDocuments" request to the Initiating Gateway to query for the document entry(ies) for the consent document(s).
 - The Initiating Gateway returns an ITI-38 response containing document entry(ies) for the consent document(s).
 - The Responding Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Retrieve [ITI-39] request to the Initiating Gateway to retrieve the document(s).
 - The Initiating Gateway retrieves the requested document(s) from its repositories and returns an ITI-39 response containing the document(s).
 - The Responding Gateway completes its access determination and grants the Initiating Gateway access for this transaction.
 - The use case resumes at step 2.
29. Responding Gateway retrieves consent document during Cross Gateway Query transaction
- In step 3, the Initiating Gateway has included in its security information reference to consent document(s) applicable to this request.
 - The Responding Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Query [ITI-38] "FindDocuments" request to the Initiating Gateway to query for the document entry(ies) for the consent document(s).
 - The Initiating Gateway returns an ITI-38 response containing document entry(ies) for the consent document(s).
 - The Responding Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Retrieve [ITI-39] request to the Initiating Gateway to retrieve the document(s).
 - The Initiating Gateway retrieves the requested document(s) from its repositories and returns an ITI-39 response containing the document(s).
 - The Responding Gateway completes its access determination and grants the Initiating Gateway access for this transaction.
 - The use case resumes at step 4.
30. Responding Gateway retrieves consent document during Cross Gateway Retrieve transaction
- In step 5, the Initiating Gateway has included in its security information reference to consent document(s) applicable to this request.
 - The Responding Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Query [ITI-38] "FindDocuments" request to the Initiating Gateway to query for the document entry(ies) for the consent document(s).
 - The Initiating Gateway returns an ITI-38 response containing document entry(ies) for the consent document(s).
 - The Responding Gateway sends an IHE Cross Gateway Retrieve [ITI-39] request to the Initiating Gateway to retrieve the document(s).
 - The Initiating Gateway retrieves the requested document(s) from its repositories and returns an ITI-39 response containing the document(s).
 - The Responding Gateway completes its access determination and grants the Initiating Gateway access for this transaction.
 - The use case resumes at step 6.

7.2.7. Error Flows

1. Either Gateway rejects TLS session
 - a. In step 1, 3, or 5, the TLS session needed for the HTTPS/SOAP transaction is rejected by either Gateway. This could be due to a number of reasons, such as:
 - i. The other gateway presents an untrusted, expired, or revoked certificate in the TLS handshake
 - ii. Failure to agree on an algorithm suite
 - iii. Other policy incompatibility
 - b. The rejecting Gateway takes appropriate action to log the error.
 - c. The use case continues at step 7.
2. Error in SOAP request
 - a. In step 2, 4, or 6, the Responding Gateway detects a problem with the SOAP request. This could be due to a number of reasons, such as:
 - i. Missing required elements (e.g. timestamp)
 - ii. Expired timestamp
 - iii. Invalid XML signature
 - iv. Untrusted, expired, or revoked certificate used to create XML signature
 - b. The Responding Gateway executes one of the following subflows:
 - i. Subflow 1: The Responding Gateway returns a standard SOAP fault, for example: wsse:FailedAuthentication defined in SOAP Message Security 1.1.
 - ii. Subflow 2: The Responding Gateway returns a response with no results, for example, no match for XCPD. This case is where the Responding Gateway wishes to “hide the error” to avoid phishing attempts.
 - c. The Responding Gateway takes appropriate action to log the error.
 - d. The use case continues at step 7.
3. Error in SOAP response
 - a. Following step 2, 4, or 6, the Initiating Gateway detects a problem with the SOAP response. This could be due to a number of reasons, such as:
 - i. Missing required elements (e.g. timestamp)
 - ii. Expired timestamp
 - iii. Invalid/missing signature confirmation
 - b. The Initiating Gateway takes appropriate action to log the error.
 - c. The use case continues at step 7.
4. Access denied
 - a. In step 2, 4, or 6, the Responding Gateway makes a determination that this request is to be denied due to some business rule/policy, for example, patient consent.
 - b. The Responding Gateway executes one of the following subflows:
 - i. Subflow 1: The Responding Gateway returns a transaction-specific error code, for example AnswerNotAvailable for XCPD or XDSRegistryError for XCA.
 - ii. Subflow 2: The Responding Gateway returns the Carequality SOAP fault cq:UserNotAuthorized (see Transaction Detail Requirements). In this case, because the Initiating Gateway has been notified explicitly that there was an access denial, the user can try again later, either obtaining consent through out of band means or asserting an access consent document.
 - iii. Subflow 3: The Responding Gateway returns a standard SOAP fault, for example: wsse:FailedAuthentication defined in SOAP Message Security 1.1.

- iv. Subflow 4: The Responding Gateway returns a response with no results, for example, no match for XCPD. This case is where the Responding Gateway wishes to “hide the error” to avoid phishing attempts.
 - c. The use case continues at step 7.
- 5. Responding Gateway not found
 - a. In all of the available “Find Service Endpoint” alternate flows, no Responding Gateway can be found in any directory.
 - b. The use case ends.
- 6. No patient match
 - a. In step 2, the Responding Gateway is unable to make a conclusive match. This could be due to no matching patients, or due to an inability to disambiguate multiple potential matches. The Responding Gateway returns no RegistrationEvents (presence of RegistrationEvent elements in the response message indicate matches).
 - b. The use case continues at step 7.
- 7. Initiating Gateway vetoes correlation
 - a. Following step 2, even though the Responding Gateway returned a positive match, the Initiating Gateway compares the returned demographics to its own and decides that the patient does not match.
 - b. The use case continues at step 7.
- 8. XCPD: Responding Gateway returns AnswerNotAvailable
 - a. In step 2, the Responding Gateway determines that the answer is not available, and returns the code AnswerNotAvailable. This implies human intervention may be needed.
 - b. The use case continues at step 7.
- 9. XCPD: Responding Gateway cannot process Cross Gateway Patient Discovery for internal reasons
 - a. In step 2, the Responding Gateway cannot process the patient discovery for some reason specific to the responding side. The Responding Gateway returns one of the following error codes:
 - i. InternalError: an internal error or inconsistency
 - ii. ResponderBusy: not able to process the request because it is currently overloaded
- 10. Patient location query returns no patient locations
 - a. In step b.iii of alternate flow “Health data locators returned”, the Responding Gateway returns no locations.
 - b. The alternate flow continues at step b for any other communities identified.
- 11. Responding Gateway is not a health data locator for this patient
 - a. In step b.iii of alternate flow “Health data locators returned”, the Responding Gateway returns a Sender SOAP fault indicating it is “Not a Health Data Locator for the specified patient identifier”. See IHE ITI TF-2b Table 3.56-1: SOAP Faults (currently found in the XCPD Health Data Locator and Revoke Option supplement).
 - b. The alternate flow continues at step b for any other communities identified.
- 12. Responding Gateway cannot process patient location query for internal reasons
 - a. In step b.iii of alternate flow “Health data locators returned”, the Responding Gateway cannot process the document query for some reason specific to the responding side. The Responding Gateway returns a Receiver SOAP fault. See IHE ITI TF-2b Table 3.56-1: SOAP Faults (currently found in the XCPD Health Data Locator and Revoke Option supplement).
 - b. The alternate flow continues at step b for any other communities identified.

13. Patient correlation becomes invalid
 - a. Background: patient demographics may change over time, and in addition, patient records may be merged or linked. This means the quality of a patient correlation may degrade, and gateways may wish to force re-correlation. This is especially important when correlations are cached as in alternate flow “Initiating Gateway begins with cached patient correlation”. See IHE ITI TF-2: 3.55.4.2.3.1 Caching (Informative) and IHE ITI TF-3: Table 4.2.4.1-2: Error Codes.
 - b. One of the following triggering subflows occurs:
 - i. Subflow 1: In step 4, the Responding Gateway returns an ITI-38 response with error code XDSUnknownPatientId indicating the patient ID has become invalid and needs to be re-correlated.
 - ii. Subflow 2: In step 2 of the Nominal Flow, the Responding Gateway includes a CorrelationTimeToLive SOAP header containing a duration in the response. The duration expires.
 - iii. Subflow 3: In alternate flow “Demographic Query and Feed mode”, the Initiating Gateway includes a CorrelationTimeToLive SOAP header containing a duration in the request. The duration expires. At this point the Responding Gateway begins this alternate flow in the role of Initiating Gateway, and vice versa.
 - iv. Subflow 4: At any time, an Initiating Gateway sends an IHE Revoke [ITI-55] request to a Responding Gateway to inform it that a patient correlation is no longer valid. At this point the Responding Gateway begins this alternate flow in the role of Initiating Gateway, and vice versa.
 - d. The Initiating Gateway may choose to re-correlate the patient. If so, the use case begins at step 1.
14. No document entries found
 - a. In step 4, the Responding Gateway cannot find any document entries for the patient that match the query parameters. It returns the status urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep:ResponseStatusType:Success, and an empty RegistryObjectList.
 - b. The use case continues at step 7.
15. Query has bad inputs
 - a. In step 4, the Responding Gateway detects problems with the inputs, for example: an invalid stored query ID is passed in. The Responding Gateway returns one or more RegistryError elements and status of either urn:ihe:iti:2007:ResponseStatusType:PartialSuccess or urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep:ErrorSeverityType:Error. The error codes used in this flow are:
 - i. XDSMissingHomeCommunityId
 - ii. XDSStoredQueryMissingParam
 - iii. XDSStoredQueryParamNumber
 - iv. XDSUnknownCommunity
 - v. XDSUnknownPatientId
 - vi. XDSUnknownStoredQuery
 - b. The use case resumes at step 7.
16. Responding Gateway cannot process document query for internal reasons
 - a. In step 4, the Responding Gateway cannot process the document query for some reason specific to the responding side. The Responding Gateway returns one or more RegistryError elements and status of either

urn:ihe:iti:2007:ResponseStatusType:PartialSuccess or urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep>ErrorSeverityType:Error. The error codes used in this flow are:

- i. XDSRegistryBusy
- ii. XDSRegistryError
- iii. XDSRegistryOutOfResources
- iv. XDSTooManyResults

b. The use case resumes at step 7.

17. Retrieve has bad inputs

a. In step 6, the Responding Gateway detects problems with the inputs, for example: an invalid document ID is passed in. The Responding Gateway returns one or more RegistryError elements and status of either

urn:ihe:iti:2007:ResponseStatusType:PartialSuccess or urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep>ErrorSeverityType:Error. The error codes used in this flow are:

- i. XDSDocumentUniqueIdError
- ii. XDSMissingHomeCommunityId
- iii. XDSUnknownCommunity
- iv. XDSUnknownRepositoryId

b. The use case resumes at step 7.

18. Responding Gateway cannot process document retrieve for internal reasons

a. In step 6, the Responding Gateway cannot process the document retrieve for some reason specific to the responding side. The Responding Gateway returns one or more RegistryError elements and status of either

urn:ihe:iti:2007:ResponseStatusType:PartialSuccess or urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep>ErrorSeverityType:Error. The error codes used in this flow are:

- i. XDSRepositoryBusy
- ii. XDSRepositoryError
- iii. XDSRepositoryOutOfResources

b. The use case resumes at step 7.

8.0 Technical Requirements and Guidance

8.1. Roles

Carequality introduces the concept of “roles”, which are high-level aggregations of actors and behavior. See Section 2 of this Guide for additional information.

8.1.1. Query Initiator

Informative: Directory services are not in scope for the current version, but will be added in the future.

CONF-TBD: Each Query Initiator MUST provide an XCPD Initiating Gateway actor and support required transactions as described in this Technical Requirements and Guidance section.

Commented [A4]: Following public comment, each conformance statement will be numbered.

CONF-TBD: Each Query Initiator MUST provide an XCA Initiating Gateway actor and support required transactions as described in this Technical Requirements and Guidance section.

8.1.2. Query Responder

CONF-TBD: Each Query Responder MUST provide an XCPD Responding Gateway actor and support required transactions as described in this Technical Requirements and Guidance section.

CONF-TBD: Each Query Responder MUST provide an XCA Responding Gateway actor and support required transactions as described in this Technical Requirements and Guidance section.

8.1.3. Record Locator Service

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway actor that supports the Health Data Locator option is considered a Carequality Record Locator Service and MUST adhere to the requirements in this Technical Requirements and Guidance section.

8.2. Overall Query Workflow

These requirements address multiple transactions and other cross-cutting concerns in the Query workflow.

8.2.1. Use Case Flow Requirements


This table shows the required flows from the Query use case for the Initiating (I) and Responding (R) Gateways.

Flow	I/R	Requirements
Nominal Flow	R	Required
Nominal Flow (Steps 1 and 2)	I	Choice: MUST support at least one of: Nominal Flow or Demographic Query and Feed mode
Nominal Flow (Steps 3-7)	I	Required
Multiple matches returned with different HCIDs	R	Optional

Multiple matches returned with different HCIDs	I	Required
Document entries returned with different HCIDs	R	Not currently permitted.
Document entries returned with different HCIDs	I	Required. The Initiating Gateway MUST implement at least one of the subflows to handle this case.
Patient correlation becomes invalid	R	Required. Responding Gateways MUST have the ability to detect that a patient correlation has become invalid, and report that via the error code XDSUnknownPatientId. Responding Gateways MAY additionally support Revoke and/or CorrelationTimeToLive.
Patient correlation becomes invalid	I	Required. Initiating Gateways MUST have the ability to handle the error code XDSUnknownPatientId, and SHOULD re-correlate. Initiating Gateways MAY additionally support Revoke and/or CorrelationTimeToLive.
Responding Gateway retrieves consent document during Cross Gateway Patient Discovery transaction	I/R	Optional. Initiating Gateway MAY include reference to consent document(s). Responding Gateway MAY query, retrieve and parse the consent document(s), and MAY incorporate the results into their access control decision. Responding Gateway MUST gracefully handle the reference even if it is ignored. This workflow is expected to be profiled at a higher level.
Responding Gateway retrieves consent document during Cross Gateway Query transaction	I/R	Optional. Initiating Gateway MAY include reference to consent document(s). Responding Gateway MAY query, retrieve and parse the consent document(s), and MAY incorporate the results into their access control decision. Responding Gateway MUST gracefully handle the reference even if it is ignored. This workflow is expected to be profiled at a higher level.
Responding Gateway retrieves consent document during Cross Gateway Retrieve transaction	I/R	Optional. Initiating Gateway MAY include reference to consent document(s). Responding Gateway MAY query, retrieve and parse the consent document(s), and MAY incorporate the results into their access control decision. Responding Gateway MUST gracefully handle the reference even if it is ignored. This workflow is expected to be profiled at a higher level.

8.2.2. Detailed Requirements

Informative: Carequality will attempt, through guidance and constraints, to maintain forward and backward compatibility, but this will be subject to overriding concerns by participants.

CONF-TBD: All requirements pertaining to the IHE ITI Technical Framework refer to [Revision 11.0 \(2014\)](#), including: 

- IHE IT Infrastructure Technical Framework Supplement – XCPD Health Data Locator Query & Revoke Option, Rev. 2.6 – 2014-10-20
- All Change Proposals in FinalText used in the 2015 IHE NA Connectathon, which are:

Commented [A5]: See open question [QUERY-003](#).

- TBD

CONF-TBD: If an Initiating Gateway receives a Cross Gateway Patient Discovery (ITI-55) response with a match containing an HCID different from the Responding Gateway's community, and wishes to make a subsequent Patient Location Query (ITI-56) or Cross Gateway Query (ITI-38) using that match, it MUST resolve the HCID to a web services endpoint.

CONF-TBD: If an Initiating Gateway receives a Patient Location Query (ITI-56) response with a patient location with an HCID different from the Responding Gateway's community, and wishes to make a subsequent Cross Gateway Query (ITI-38) using that match, it MUST resolve the HCID to a web services endpoint.

Informative: See Section 8.3, Directory Services, for more information on this topic.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway MAY support the Revoke option.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway MAY support the Revoke option.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway that includes the CorrelationTimeToLive SOAP header in XCPD requests MUST NOT send a mustUnderstand value of "true" or "1".

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway MAY support the CorrelationTimeToLive SOAP header in XCPD requests.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway that includes the CorrelationTimeToLive SOAP header in XCPD responses MUST NOT send a mustUnderstand value of "true" or "1".

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway MAY support the CorrelationTimeToLive SOAP header in XCPD responses.

Informative: The XCPD profile, in sections 3.55.4.1.2 and 3.55.4.2.2, suggests not caching correlations unless CorrelationTimeToLive is sent. Carequality adopts the non-normative position that allowing optimistic caching, combined with requiring systems to detect patient identity issues and return XDSUnknownPatientId, is more deterministic and preferable.

Informative: The following requirement was prompted by a real system that wished to expose an XCPD gateway as essentially "only" an RLS.

CONF-TBD: A Query Responder that returns a patient ID in an XCPD response but does not have any clinical documents for that patient (whether it simply has no documents, or because it is acting as an RLS only), MUST return zero documents, not an XDSUnknownPatientID error code, in a response to an XCA Query for that patient ID.

Commented [A6]: See open question QUERY-004.

Commented [A7]: See open question QUERY-005.

Commented [A8]: See open question QUERY-005.

8.3. Directory Services

8.3.1. Use Case Flow Requirements

This table shows the required flows from the Query use case for the Initiating Gateway (I) and Participant Gateway Directory (D).

Flow	I/D	Requirements
Nominal Flow	I	Required. Nominal flow assumes Initiating Gateway has already obtained endpoint(s) in some way.
Find Service Endpoint by HCID	I/D	Optional - this feature is not currently in scope and is not tested by Carequality.
Find Service Endpoint by search parameters	I/D	Optional - this feature is not currently in scope and is not tested by Carequality.
Find Service Endpoint by external directory	I	Optional
Find Service Endpoint – multiple Responding Gateways found	I	Required – Initiating Gateways MUST be able to handle the complexities associated with having multiple gateways for a given query.
Use of directory to obtain information other than Responding Gateway endpoints	I	Optional
Responding Gateway not found	I/D	Optional - this feature is not currently in scope and is not tested by Carequality.

8.3.2. Detailed Requirements

Specific online directory services are not in scope for the current version, but will be added in the future. The current flows and requirements allow for much flexibility in how an Initiating Gateway might obtain endpoints.

CONF-TBD: An Initiating Gateway MUST have some way of knowing or discovering the service endpoints for a Responding Gateway.

CONF-TBD: An Initiating Gateway MUST have some way of resolving a HCID to the desired service endpoints for a Responding Gateway.

8.4. Security and Transport

8.4.1. Use Case Flow Requirements

This table shows the required flows from the Query use case for the Initiating (I) and Responding (R) Gateways.

Flow	I/R	Requirements
Nominal Flow	I/R	Required. Nominal flow assumes all security aspects function successfully.
Either Gateway rejects TLS session	I/R	Required. Any Gateway MUST detect error conditions and reject TLS sessions. Any Gateway MUST handle a TLS session rejected by another Gateway.
Error in SOAP request	I/R	Required. A Responding Gateway MUST detect error conditions and implement at least one of the subflows. An Initiating Gateway MUST be able to handle every way of reporting these errors.
Error in SOAP response	I	Required. An Initiating Gateway MUST detect and handle error conditions.
Access denied	R	Optional
Access denied	I	Required. The Initiating Gateway MUST be able to handle every way of reporting access denial.

8.4.2. Referenced Specifications

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway MUST implement the requirements in NHIN Messaging Platform 3.0 and NHIN Authorization Framework 3.0 (maintained by eHealth Exchange) except as constrained by this document.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway MUST implement the requirements in NHIN Messaging Platform 3.0 and NHIN Authorization Framework 3.0 (maintained by eHealth Exchange) except as constrained by this document.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST implement the requirements in NHIN Messaging Platform 3.0 and NHIN Authorization Framework 3.0 (maintained by eHealth Exchange) except as constrained by this document.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MUST implement the requirements in NHIN Messaging Platform 3.0 and NHIN Authorization Framework 3.0 (maintained by eHealth Exchange) except as constrained by this document.

8.4.3. Technical Trust

In order to satisfy the Carequality requirements of: Federated (decentralized) trust; avoiding operational burden to Carequality; avoid the need for Carequality to certify Certification Authorities; enabling exchange with Federal partners; simplicity; and wide-scale support by existing TLS implementations. Carequality technical trust is implemented by leveraging the federated trust model of the Federal Bridge Certification Authority program, as currently curated by ID Management at <http://www.idmanagement.gov>.

<<Carequality listed networks or organizations>> will recognize and trust all valid and non-revoked server certificates listed in the Carequality Directory. Certificates and their associated private/public keys must be issued under, and meet the technical requirements of, the FBCA program.

Carequality will not certify Certification Authority vendors, but will instead rely on the FBCA program to perform certification, and Carequality will only allow approve server certificates issued by vendors recognized on the official FBCA list currently maintained at <http://www.idmanagement.gov/entities->

Commented [A9]: See open question QUERY-006.

cross-certified-federal-bridge as enabling two-way trust. Carequality will validate the technical correctness of certificate(s) supplied by each <<Carequality listed networks or organizations>>, and Carequality will follow the approved process to establish that such a <<Carequality listed networks or organizations>> is approved to be listed in the Carequality Directory, and then Carequality will list such <<Carequality listed networks or organizations>> in the Carequality Directory.

Informative: Note that the format/mechanism of the directory has not been decided yet; approved Carequality systems will be listed in the "Carequality Directory", but whether that equates to an accessible web service immediately is not decided.

Server certificates must be issued under the "Medium Assurance" class of policies, or above, under the FBCA Certificate Policy currently maintained at:
<http://www.idmanagement.gov/sites/default/files/documents/FBCA%20Certificate%20Policy%20v2.27.pdf>. <<Carequality listed networks or organizations>> must operate their security X.509 implementation, as utilized for connectivity to other <<Carequality listed networks or organizations>>, under the requirements of the NIST CMVP including running their operational systems using CMVP approved modules, configured to run in FIPS mode.

8.4.4. Digital Signatures

CONF-TBD: When Gateways include digital signatures in messages, the following instances of ds:KeyInfo:

- wsse:Security/saml:Assertion/ds:Signature/ds:KeyInfo – allows for validating the assertion signature
- wsse:Security/saml:Assertion/saml:Subject/saml:SubjectConfirmation/saml:SubjectConfirmationData/ds:KeyInfo – allows for validating the timestamp signature
- ds:Signature/ds:KeyInfo of any additional digital signatures

are limited to the following flavors of specifying KeyInfo such that the signature can be validated:

- ds:KeyInfo/ds:KeyValue/ds:RSAKeyValue
- ds:KeyInfo/ds:X509Data, and the included certificate must contain an RSA public key

Informative: This does not include the ds:KeyInfo instance in the timestamp signature: wsse:Security/ds:Signature/ds:KeyInfo/wsse:SecurityTokenReference, which uses Holder-of-Key to indirectly reference the SAML assertion SubjectConfirmation that contains the ultimate KeyInfo.

Informative: These flavors of KeyInfo are in common use and are known to be interoperable; they allow a receiving system to validate a signature without a priori knowledge or out-of-band exchange of the sender's public key, since the public key is included in the signature itself.

8.4.5. Reporting Access Denials

CONF-TBD: While Responding Gateways MAY use any of the defined mechanisms in the Access Denied variant flow to report access denial errors, they SHOULD use the Carequality UserNotAuthorized SOAP fault. When formatting this fault, Responding Gateways MUST return it as follows:

- Fault/Code/Value = env:Sender
- Fault/Code/Subcode/Value = cq:UserNotAuthorized
- Fault/Reason/Text = The user is not authorized to access this particular information.

The above namespace prefixes are defined as:

- env = http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope
- cq = TBD

Commented [A10]: See open question QUERY-007.

8.5. Patient Discovery

8.5.1. Use Case Flow Requirements

This table shows the required flows from the Query use case for the Initiating (I) and Responding (R) Gateways.

Flow	I/R	Requirements
Nominal Flow (Steps 1 and 2)	R	Required
Nominal Flow (Steps 1 and 2)	I	Choice: MUST support at least one of: Nominal Flow or Demographic Query and Feed mode.
Demographic Query and Feed mode	R	Required. Responding Gateways MAY use the patient ID passed in to persist a correlation.
Demographic Query and Feed mode	I	Choice: MUST support at least one of: Nominal Flow or Demographic Query and Feed mode.
Known third party patient identifier	R	Optional. Responding Gateways MAY return known third party patient identifiers in responses. Responding Gateways MAY base matches on known third party patient identifiers received in requests.
Known third party patient identifier	I	Optional. Initiating Gateways MAY send known third party patient identifiers in requests. Initiating Gateways MAY base matches on known third party patient identifiers received in responses.
Ambiguous match may be resolved with more demographics	R	Optional
Ambiguous match may be resolved with more demographics	I	Required. If received in a response, Initiating Gateways MAY treat the same as no patient match found.
Multiple matches returned within a given HCID	R	Optional

Multiple matches returned within a given HCID	I	Required
Asynchronous patient discovery	R	Optional, but this feature is not used currently by Carequality, nor will it be tested.
Asynchronous patient discovery	I	Not permitted. See Detailed Requirements.
Deferred patient discovery	I/R	Optional, but this feature is not used currently by Carequality, nor will it be tested.
No patient match	I/R	Required
Initiating Gateway vetoes correlation	R	N/A. If the IG vetoes, the RG is unaware of it.
Initiating Gateway vetoes correlation	I	Optional
XCPD: Responding Gateway returns AnswerNotAvailable	R	Optional
XCPD: Responding Gateway returns AnswerNotAvailable	I	Required
XCPD: Responding Gateway cannot process Cross Gateway Patient Discovery for internal reasons	R	Optional
XCPD: Responding Gateway cannot process Cross Gateway Patient Discovery for internal reasons	I	Required

8.5.2. Detailed Requirements



CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway **MUST** implement the appropriate requirements in IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway **MUST** implement the appropriate requirements in IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway **MUST NOT** use the Asynchronous Web Services Exchange option.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway **MAY** use the Asynchronous Web Services Exchange option. However, Carequality XCPD Initiating Gateways are not permitted to send asynchronous requests. So, Carequality will neither utilize nor test this feature.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway MAY support the Deferred Response option. However, Carequality is not currently using this, so it will not be tested.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway MUST NOT require a Responding Gateway to support the Deferred Response option as a precondition to interoperate.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway MAY support the Deferred Response option. However, Carequality is not currently using this, so it will not be tested.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway MUST send, in the ITI-55 Cross Gateway Patient Discovery request, all demographic parameters that are available and can be sent and are not constrained by local policy.

See IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.4.1.2.2 Message Information Model of the Patient Registry Query by Demographics Message.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway MUST send, in each RegistrationEvent in the ITI-55 Cross Gateway Patient Discovery response, all demographic parameters that are available and can be sent and are not constrained by local policy.

See IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.55.4.2.2.2 Message Information Model of the Patient Registry Find Candidates Response Message.

Informative: The XCPD request parameters MatchAlgorithm and MinimumDegreeMatch do not have deterministic meaning defined by the XCPD profile. Responding Gateways may make known if/how they will interpret these parameters in light of their specific matching algorithms, but how this is communicated is out of scope of this guide.

Commented [A11]: See open question **QUERY-008**.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway SHOULD omit request parameters MatchAlgorithm and MinimumDegreeMatch unless their interpretation by the Responding Gateway is understood.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway that receives multiple matches with the same HCID and a different AAID in an XCPD response SHOULD manually review the matches before proceeding. They may represent either multiple people who could not be resolved to a single match (IHE interpretation) or multiple sources of documents for the same person (eHealth Exchange interpretation).

Commented [A12]: See open question **QUERY-001**.

Informative: There is a slight imbalance between the type of the patient ID returned in an XCPD response, which is of HL7V3 II type, and the type of the patient ID passed in a XCA Cross Gateway Query request, which is of HL7V2 CX type. The CX type as defined in HL7 2.5.1 suggests length restrictions on the assigning authority (227 chars) and ID Number (15 chars), which are not imposed on the corresponding HL7V3 II root and extension.

Commented [A13]: See open question **QUERY-009**.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway MUST ensure that any HL7V3 II patient identifiers returned in an XCPD response are valid for use in an XCA Cross Gateway Query request.

8.6. Record Locator Services

8.6.1. Use Case Flow Requirements

This table shows the required flows from the Query use case for the Initiating (I) and Responding (R) Gateways.

Flow	I/R	Requirements
Health data locators returned	R	Optional
Health data locators returned	I	Required. Initiating Gateways MUST be able to handle responses that indicate Health Data Locators, and MAY make use of them with ITI-56 transactions.
Asynchronous patient location query	R	Optional, but this feature is not used currently by Carequality, nor will it be tested.
Asynchronous patient location query	I	Not permitted. See Patient Discovery Detailed Requirements.
Patient location query returns no patient locations	I/R	Required
Responding Gateway is not a health data locator for this patient	I/R	Required
Responding Gateway cannot process patient location query for internal reasons	R	Optional
Responding Gateway cannot process patient location query for internal reasons	I	Required

8.6.2. Detailed Requirements



Informative: A Record Locator Service is an optional value-added service provided by an XCPD Responding Gateway. It adds value by potentially limiting the scope of communities a requester needs to contact in order to find information about a patient.

Scope of the RLS: A given RLS covers some number of communities, and it is important that the requesting user understands this scope, and does not assume that the RLS is asserting knowledge about the presence or absence of patient data in communities outside of that scope.

Quality of the RLS: It is important to note that the RLS interface and behavior requirements do not specify how the service keeps track of patient data, nor do they guarantee the accuracy or completeness

of results. For example, a community could be returned as a possible location that has no clinical documents for this patient, or a community could be left out of the results that does have clinical documents for this patient. The former is less of a problem, as it will be discovered when attempting to query for documents, but the latter situation can hide useful clinical data, which might have been found using a broader search. Individual record locator services can differentiate by explaining and demonstrating how they ensure accurate results.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway MAY support the Health Data Locator option.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway MAY support the Health Data Locator option.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Initiating Gateway exercising ITI-56 MUST implement the appropriate requirements in IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.56.

CONF-TBD: An XCPD Responding Gateway exercising ITI-56 MUST implement the appropriate requirements in IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.56.

8.7. Document Query and Retrieve

8.7.1. Use Case Flow Requirements

This table shows the required flows from the Query use case for the Initiating (I) and Responding (R) Gateways.

Flow	I/R	Requirements
Nominal Flow (Steps 3 and 4)	I/R	Required
Chunked document query	R	Required
Chunked document query	I	Optional
Advanced document queries	I/R	See Detailed Requirements.
Query for deprecated documents	R	Required
Query for deprecated documents	I	Optional
Query returns partial success	R	Conditional. If Responding Gateway can encounter partial success, it MUST communicate it. See Detailed Requirements.
Query returns partial success	I	Required. See Detailed Requirements.
Asynchronous document query	R	Optional, but this feature is not used currently by Carequality, nor will it be tested.
Asynchronous document query	I	Not permitted. See Detailed Requirements.

On-demand documents, initial query/retrieve	R	Conditional. MUST support if supports the On-Demand Documents option.
On-demand documents, initial query/retrieve	I	Required
On-demand documents, retrieve after change in underlying data	R	Conditional. MUST support if supports the On-Demand Documents option.
On-demand documents, retrieve after change in underlying data	I	Required
On-demand documents, retrieve persisted document after change in underlying data	R	Conditional. MUST support if supports the On-Demand Documents option (which requires the Persistence of Retrieved Documents Option).
On-demand documents, retrieve persisted document after change in underlying data	I	Optional. Initiating Gateway MAY choose to retrieve persisted documents.
Initiating Gateway begins with cached patient correlation	R	Required
Initiating Gateway begins with cached patient correlation	I	Optional. Initiating Gateway MAY cache correlations.
Retrieve returns partial success	I/R	Conditional. See Detailed Requirements.
Asynchronous document retrieve	R	Optional, but this feature is not used currently by Carequality, nor will it be tested.
Asynchronous document retrieve	I	Not permitted. See Detailed Requirements.
Initiating Gateway begins with cached document entry	R	Required
Initiating Gateway begins with cached document entry	I	Optional. Initiating Gateway MAY cache document entries.

No document entries found	I/R	Required
Query has bad inputs	I/R	Required. Responding Gateway MUST detect these conditions and Initiating Gateway MUST be able to handle these error codes. See Detailed Requirements.
Responding Gateway cannot process document query for internal reasons	R	Optional
Responding Gateway cannot process document query for internal reasons	I	Required
Retrieve has bad inputs	I/R	Required
Responding Gateway cannot process document retrieve for internal reasons	R	Optional
Responding Gateway cannot process document retrieve for internal reasons	I	Required

8.7.2. Detailed Requirements

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST implement the appropriate requirements in IHE ITI TF Vol2b: 3.38 and 3.39.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MUST implement the requirements in IHE ITI TF Vol2b: 3.38 and 3.39.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MAY satisfy ITI-38 and ITI-39 transactions through either a single endpoint or one endpoint for each.

CONF-TBD: Carequality adopts the value sets for document metadata elements defined in HITSP C80, version 2.0.1, according to the table below:



Document Metadata	HITSP C80 reference	scheme OID
classCode	HITSP C80, version 2.0.1, table 2-144	2.16.840.1.113883.6.1
confidentialityCode	HITSP C80, version 2.0.1, table 2-150.	2.16.840.1.113883.5.25

eventCodeList	Very specific to the type of document and not expected to be constrained externally.	
formatCode	HITSP C80, version 2.0.1, table 2-152, not including concept code urn:nhin:names:acp:XACML	1.3.6.1.4.1.19376.1.2.3
healthcareFacilityTypeCode	HITSP C80, version 2.0.1, table 2-146	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96
practiceSettingCode	HITSP C80, version 2.0.1, table 2-149 which is a list of members of the value set in table 2-148	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96
typeCode	HITSP C80, version 2.0.1, table 2-144 - same list of values as used for classCode	2.16.840.1.113883.6.1

Informative: Carequality is adopting these value sets in the absence of any other governing body for nationwide value sets. We anticipate an SDO maintaining these value sets in the future and transitioning Carequality to use the new value sets.

<TBD insert normative table showing valid tuples of format code, class code, type code, mime type, and how they translate to specific document content types>

Commented [A14]: See open question **QUERY-010**.

Informative: An XCA Initiating Gateway SHOULD make no assumptions that XCA Responding Gateways use the HITSP C80 vocabulary. If useful clinical data is not received while querying, filtering by coded values, consider not filtering by coded values.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway SHOULD use the vocabulary defined in HITSP C80, version 2.0.1 as well as the schemes identified in the above table, for document metadata elements.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MAY support the XDS Affinity Domain option. However, Carequality will neither make use of nor test this option.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST NOT use the Asynchronous Web Services Exchange option.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MAY use the Asynchronous Web Services Exchange option. However, Carequality XCA Initiating Gateways are not permitted to send asynchronous requests. So, Carequality will neither utilize nor test this feature.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST support the On-Demand Documents option.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MAY support the On-Demand Documents option.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway that supports the On-Demand Documents option MUST support the Persistence of Retrieved Documents option.

Informative: Because there is no in-band way for Initiating Gateways to know if they are interacting with Stable or On-Demand systems, the following guidance ensures the Initiating Gateway will not miss available clinical data.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway **MUST** request both On-Demand and Stable document entries, unless it is exercising a use case that requires targeted query of only On-Demand or Stable.

Informative: Some XCA Responding Gateways that support the On-Demand Documents option and the Persistence of Retrieved Documents Option deprecate persisted stable documents as soon as they are generated.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway wishing to retrieve a persisted stable document from an On-Demand document entry **MUST** include the document status of `urn:oasis:names:tc:ebxml-regrep:StatusType:Deprecated` in the query.

Informative: An XCA Initiating Gateway retrieving the same On-Demand document entry multiple times can compare the `NewDocumentUniqueId` to the one obtained with the previous retrieve. If they are the same, then the data has not changed. If they are different, then the data may have changed. See ITI TF Vol2b 3.43.4.2.2 Message Semantics.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway **SHOULD NOT** return the optional elements `NewRepositoryUniqueId` and `NewDocumentUniqueId` for stable documents in an ITI-39 response.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway that does not support the Persistence of Retrieved Documents Option **SHOULD NOT** return the optional element `NewRepositoryUniqueId` for on-demand documents in an ITI-39 response, as it does not have any defined meaning.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway **MUST** support the `FindDocuments` stored query.

Informative: The concepts of submission sets, folders and associations are not used by Carequality. Therefore, if an XCA Initiating Gateway sends the following stored queries it may receive no results: `FindSubmissionSets`, `FindFolders`, `GetAll`, `GetFolders`, `GetAssociations`, `GetDocumentsAndAssociations`, `GetSubmissionSets`, `GetSubmissionSetAndContents`, `GetFolderAndContents`, `GetFoldersForDocument`, `GetRelatedDocuments`.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway **MUST** support all stored queries in IHE ITI TF Vol2b: Table 3.38.4.1.2.3-1.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway **MAY** return zero elements for non-supported concepts as specified in IHE ITI TF Vol2b: Table 3.38.4.1.2.3-1.

Informative: `FindDocumentsByReferenceId` is a relatively new stored query that is included in the XDS.b profile via a named option. It is not listed as an option in XCA, and further, XCA includes all XDS.b queries by reference. Carequality does not intend to use this query at this time.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway SHOULD NOT send the FindDocumentsByReferenceId stored query.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway, if it receives a FindDocumentsByReferenceId stored query, MAY do any of the following: support it, return zero elements, or return the XDSUnknownStoredQuery error.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MUST compare coded value query parameters by the combination of code and scheme.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MUST compare date query parameters to the corresponding metadata as specified in IHE ITI TF Vol2a: 3.18.4.1.2.3.3 Date/Time Coding.

Informative: The requirements below for conveying errors to end users may be met via logs.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST, in the case of a Failure result in an ITI-38 response, convey to an end user that no documents are currently available as queried, and convey the reasons for the problem(s) via the RegistryError elements returned.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST, in the case of a PartialSuccess result in an ITI-38 response, convey to an end user that some but not all documents are currently available as queried, and convey the reasons for the problem(s) via the RegistryError elements returned.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST, in the case of a Failure result in an ITI-39 response, convey to an end user that no documents were retrieved, and convey the reasons for the problems via the RegistryError elements returned.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Initiating Gateway MUST, in the case of a PartialSuccess result in an ITI-39 response, convey to an end user which documents were retrieved and which were not, and convey the reasons for the problems via the RegistryError elements returned.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MUST detect the error conditions for the following ITI-38 error codes (see IHE ITI TF Vol3, section 4) and return those errors:

- XDSMissingHomeCommunityId (Informative: already required by IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.3)
- XDSToredQueryMissingParam
- XDSToredQueryParamNumber (Informative: already required by IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.4.1.3)
- XDSUnknownCommunity (Informative: already required by IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.3)
- XDSUnknownPatientId or return successful response with no elements (Informative: already required by IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.2.2)
- XDSUnknownStoredQuery (Informative: already required by IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.4.1.3)

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MAY detect the error conditions for the following ITI-38 error codes (see IHE ITI TF Vol3, section 4) and return those errors:

- XDSRegistryBusy

Commented [A15]: See resolved question **QUERY-012**.

- XDSRegistryError
- XDSRegistryOutOfResources
- XDSTooManyResults

Informative: The existing requirements around ITI-38 error reporting are summarized here:

- IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.3 Expected Actions, requires Vol 2a: 3.18.4.1.3 Expected Actions.
- IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.4.1.3 Expected Actions, references IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.4 Error Reporting.
- IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.4 Error Reporting, describes how to format an error. Specifically, “location” is optional and contains “module name and line number or stack trace if appropriate.”
- IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.3 Expected Actions, states “every RegistryError element returned in the response shall have the location attribute set to the homeCommunityId of the Responding Gateway”. This requirement overrides the one in ITI TF-3: 4.2.4.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway, in the case of a combination of success and failure in an ITI-38 or ITI-39 transaction, MUST return a PartialSuccess result, if permitted by policy.

Informative: This is a restriction over the base requirement in 3.38.4.1.3 Expected Actions. Examples: when it is only able to provide some but not all documents available, or when it cannot assert whether all documents can be located, e.g., in the case of downtime of components of the network(s) that the Responding Gateway represents.

Informative: The policy allowance above is intended to permit hiding the fact that documents could not be returned for access consent reasons.

Informative: There is a gap in the requirements for ITI-39 error reporting. IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.39.4.1.3 Expected Actions, requires Vol 2b: 3.43.4.1.3 Expected Actions. However, this section pertains to the Initiating Gateway only. There is no reference to Vol 2b: 3.43.4.2.3, which requires the responding side to report errors and which references IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.4 Error Reporting. This gap is being addressed via a CP. In the meantime, the following error reporting requirements are added.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MUST detect the error conditions for the following ITI-39 error codes (see IHE ITI TF Vol3, section 4) and return those errors:

- XDSDocumentUniquelError
- XDSMissingHomeCommunityId
- XDSUnknownCommunity
- XDSUnknownRepositoryId

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MAY detect the error conditions for the following ITI-39 error codes (see IHE ITI TF Vol3, section 4) and return those errors:

- XDSRepositoryBusy
- XDSRepositoryError
- XDSRepositoryOutOfResources

Commented [A16]: See resolved question **QUERY-013**.

Commented [A17]: See resolved question **QUERY-014**.

Informative: There is a conflict in the requirements for ITI-39 error reporting. IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.39.4.1.3 Expected Actions, states “Every RegistryError element returned in the response shall have the location attribute set to the homeCommunityId of the Responding Gateway”. However, IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.43.5 Protocol Requirements states “location contains the DocumentUniqueId of the document requested”. This conflict is being addressed via a CP. In the meantime, the following error reporting requirement allows for any reasonable interpretation.

CONF-TBD: An XCA Responding Gateway MUST, when returning RegistryErrors in an ITI-39 response, provide in the location attribute: the homeCommunityId of the Responding Gateway, the DocumentUniqueId of the document requested, or both.

Commented [A18]: See resolved question **QUERY-014**.

9.0 Issues and Questions

9.1 Open Issues and Questions

QUERY-001: Are the semantics of the use case alternate flow “Multiple matches returned within a given HCID” accurate? They state that each record represents a distinct patient, which must be disambiguated. However, eHealth Exchange imposes an additional constraint that of matches within a given HCID, those with different AADs represent multiple sources of data for the same person, not different people. It doesn’t appear both of these interpretations can be true. Please also confirm the semantics for alternate flow “Multiple matches returned with different HIDs”.

We received the semantics for ITI through an email conversation with an ITI SME. We have posed this question both to the eHealth Exchange (<http://exchange-specifications.wikispaces.com/share/view/72162420>) and to the ITI Technical Committee (<https://groups.google.com/forum/?hl=en#!topic/ititech/U0ZjjCv9fhU>) for clarification.

QUERY-003: Adoption of the latest ITI TF will cause a breaking change with all the members of the eHealth Exchange, who have implemented against either the 2009 (6.0) or 2010 (7.0) revisions. Rather than adopting this wholesale, should Carequality either a. adopt multiple revisions, where each revision is not assumed to be compatible (i.e. as eHEX has done with its 2010 and 2011 revisions), or b. make an attempt to define interoperability requirements and guidance, such that implementations to different versions of the TF can interoperate? Carequality is seeking feedback on this question.

QUERY-004: What CPs will Carequality adopt in addition to the 2014 ITI TF?

Tentatively the CPs in effect as of the 2015 NA Connectathon, but this list is still TBD.

QUERY-005: There appears to be a typo in section 3.55.4.2.2 of XCPD – it reads: “The Responding Gateway may specify a duration value in the SOAP Header element of the request”. This probably should say “response”. For the purposes of this document, we have assumed, based on the surrounding text, that it is a typo, and have posted a question to the ITI Technical Committee: https://groups.google.com/forum/?hl=en#!topic/ititech/9n2_AC7fp6I

QUERY-006: What mechanism(s) will Carequality adopt for technical trust between systems?

This document contains draft text for technical trust in section 8.4.3 – we are explicitly seeking feedback during Public Comment.

QUERY-007: Complete the definition of the new SOAP fault UserNotAuthorized.

It currently needs a namespace for the fault. We could use just a URN, or if we want to define a whole schema we could host it at a URL.

QUERY-008: The XCPD request parameters MatchAlgorithm and MinimumDegreeMatch appear to be “hooks” for higher-level profiles/agreements to define, i.e. they do not have deterministic meaning defined by the XCPD profile. How should Gateways use these parameters to achieve maximum interoperability? Should they always omit them unless there is a higher-level profile defining how they are to be used?

We are addressing patient matching requirements in a separate supplement, and will consider these questions then. For now, we have added draft text to omit them.

QUERY-009: There is a slight imbalance between the type of the patient ID returned in an XCPD response, which is of HL7V3 II type, and the type of the patient ID passed in a XCA Cross Gateway Query request, which is of HL7V2 CX type. The CX type as defined in HL7 2.5.1 suggests length restrictions on the assigning authority (227 chars) and ID Number (15 chars), which are not imposed on the corresponding HL7V3 II root and extension.

This may cause interoperability problems with XCA Responding Gateways unable to process query requests, and/or XCA Initiating Gateways failing to send query requests, and is under active discussion with the IHE Technical Committee.

 <https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/ititech/12pmjUnMCu4>.

Added informative background and conformance statement to ensure compatibility, while this is under discussion. Seeking input on this, as some systems currently use UUIDs for the extension, which would not be compatible.

QUERY-010: It has been suggested that Carequality needs to incorporate lessons learned from eHEX and other exchanges, and enumerate the document content formats (or a common subset) that will be supported, as well as to map each content type to allowable XDS metadata values, initially taken from HITSP C80.

The document includes a placeholder for this. Creation of this table will be a parallel task during public comment.

QUERY-018: eHealth Exchange restricts ITI-55 responses to one patient ID per AAID. Initiating Gateways may not be able to process multiple IDs from the same AAID.

Anticipating that eHEX systems wishing to join Carequality will need additional testing to determine they can handle this.

QUERY-021: eHealth Exchange has adopted the more constrained RFC 3966 over the older RFD 2806 specified by HL7V3 for encoding telephone numbers. Some numbers conformant to the latter may not be to the former and may result in telephone numbers not matching.

QUERY-023: In deferred messaging, eHealth Exchange and IHE have different mechanisms for getting the endpoint to send the response to. IHE has the Initiating Gateway pass it in the `respondTo` element of the transmission wrapper. eHEX relies on the Responding Gateway looking up the deferred response endpoint in the UDDI by the HCID of the IG.

eHEX gateways wishing to participate in Carequality will already have additional requirements to support the Carequality directory. Tentatively we will add requirements and guidance to allow Responding Gateways to find it either way.

9.2. Resolved Issues and Questions

QUERY-002: The XCA profile does not currently allow a Responding Gateway to return HCLIDs other than the one it is associated with. We confirmed that there are existing production systems that count on this interpretation, and some that can handle the non-conformant response gracefully. We analyzed this in detail and asked for clarification with the ITI Technical Committee:

<https://groups.google.com/forum/?hl=en#topic/ititech/LWQywiHXANA>. They would like to relax this requirement via a new CP. The Carequality Query WG discussed this and decided to keep to the current interpretation for now but to allow for graceful handling of the error.

QUERY-011: Suggest we just start with Approved docs and not worry about on-demand docs. Are some exchanges using on-demand docs to a great extent? Because of MU CCDA requirements, won't the preponderance of docs be "stable" as created by EHRs? The answer affects the importance of issues 2, 3, 4, 5.

Resolution: We allow On-demand as an option for Responding Gateways and we know of many that use it, so we have added guidance and requirements for Initiating Gateways to support it to ensure the greatest interoperability.

QUERY-012: There is no requirement for an XCA Responding Gateway to detect and return a `XDSToredQueryMissingParam` error.

Resolution: Added a requirement as well as informative guidance about it and other errors.

QUERY-013: There is some confusion regarding the location attribute in an ITI-38 error. Specifically:

- IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.3 Expected Actions, requires Vol 2a: 3.18.4.1.3 Expected Actions.
- IHE ITI TF-2a: 3.18.4.1.3 Expected Actions, references IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.4 Error Reporting.

- IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.4 Error Reporting, describes how to format an error. Specifically, “location” is optional and contains “module name and line number or stack trace if appropriate.” See <http://exchange-specifications.wikispaces.com/share/view/51470662>
- IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.3 Expected Actions, states “every RegistryError element returned in the response shall have the location attribute set to the homeCommunityId of the Responding Gateway”.

Resolution: Since the requirement in IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.4 is optional, the one in IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.38.4.1.3 can override it. Added informative text.

QUERY-014: There is a gap in the requirements for ITI-39 error reporting. IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.39.4.1.3 Expected Actions, requires Vol 2b: 3.43.4.1.3 Expected Actions. However, this section pertains to the Initiating Gateway only. There is no reference to Vol 2b: 3.43.4.2.3, which requires the responding side to report errors and which references IHE ITI TF-3: 4.2.4 Error Reporting.

In addition, there is a conflict in the requirements for ITI-39 error reporting. IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.39.4.1.3 Expected Actions, states “Every RegistryError element returned in the response shall have the location attribute set to the homeCommunityId of the Responding Gateway”. However, IHE ITI TF-2b: 3.43.5 Protocol Requirements states “location contains the DocumentUniqueId of the document requested”.

Resolution: We have submitted a CP to cover both of these: see <https://groups.google.com/forum/?hl=en#!topic/ititech/u95UnHtY6tE>. In the meantime, added error reporting requirements for ITI-39 including a forgiving interpretation of the location attribute.

QUERY-015: When an XCA Initiating Gateway does not support on-demand but a Responding Gateway does, there is a potential for clinical information to be missed. The Initiating Gateway will query for stable document entries only. The Responding Gateway may not have stable versions of some/all documents.

Resolution: Required XCA Initiating Gateways to support on-demand for Carequality.

QUERY-016: Carequality is adopting the XCA profile, which does not have a shared set of coded values or MIME types in document metadata. Should Carequality adopt some standards in the interest of interoperability? This question is closely related to whether Carequality should do the same when it comes to document content.

Resolution: The group decided to adopt HITSP C80, as well as the schemes to use, taken from the eHEX FAQ: <http://exchange-specifications.wikispaces.com/Query+for+Documents+Home#Query>. In addition, added guidance on what to expect, as “adoption” is a SHOULD, not a MUST. See also QUERY-010.

QUERY-017: Carequality needs to define full operational details for security and transport requirements.

Resolution: Decided as a group to adopt the eHealth Exchange Messaging Platform and Authorization Framework specifications as a start, and then capture only the ways where Carequality chooses to deviate from them. This also took care of potential incompatibilities between eHEX and Carequality.

QUERY-019: eHealth Exchange does not support the XCPD ITI-55 ambiguous match return codes.

Resolution: These codes are optional to return. Allowed Initiating Gateways to optionally treat the same as no match.

QUERY-020: Networks and systems may have different requirements for which demographic parameters are required and which combinations of matching parameters result in a patient match.

Resolution: Added requirements for Initiating and Responding Gateways to send as many demographics as possible to maximize matching potential.

QUERY-022: eHealth Exchange does not “make use of” the CorrelationTimeToLive SOAP header. This means Responding Gateways are not expected to understand that header.

Resolution: Added requirement for Initiating Gateways to not use a mustUnderstand value of “true” or “1”. Added requirement for Responding Gateways making support optional.

DRAFT