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Tracking information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| IHE Domain | PCC |
| Change Proposal ID: | CP-PCC-0226 |
| Change Proposal Status: | Assigned |
| Date of last update: | July 25, 2018 |
| Person assigned: | Michael Clifton |

Change Proposal Summary information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ‘IND’ is not a value in participantRole classCode | |
| Submitter’s Name(s) and e-mail address(es): | [abderrazek.boufahja@ihe-europe.net](mailto:abderrazek.boufahja@ihe-europe.net) |
| Submission Date: | October 17, 2016 |
| Integration Profile(s) affected: | None |
| Actor(s) affected: | None |
| IHE Technical Framework or Supplement modified: | IHE\_PCC\_TF\_Vol2 |
| Volume(s) and Section(s) affected: | 6.3.4.37.20 |
| Rationale for Change:  The classCode of participantRole does not contains “IND” as possible value. Thus implementing the profile as described in the technical framework allows creation of uncompliant CDA documents. | |

Section 6.3.4.37.20 from Payer Entry 1.3.6.1.4.1.19376.1.5.3.1.4.18 : replace the classCode of the participantRole from “IND” because is not part of the table for RoleClass in the CDA R2 Normative document. We do not have which value is pertinent here.

**6.3.4.37.20 <participant typeCode='HLD'> <participantRole classCode=~~'IND'~~>**

The rationale is correct that the version of the HL7 RIM that CDA R2.0 implements does not contain a participantRole classCode of “IND”. Because the intent of this participantRole here is to denote that the associated participant is the policyholder, I would recommend we instead use the classCode “POLHOLD”.

**6.3.4.37.20 <participant typeCode='HLD'> <participantRole classCode=’POLHOLD’>**