

Case Entity v0625 — Gap Analysis Summary

Comparing: JSON Schema v0625 (MSK-Nimble sample) vs Campaigns, Cases & Interactions Schema Group (PR #12)

Date: 2026-02-10

Overview

The v0625 JSON represents a flattened, case-centric snapshot of an MSK/Nimble episode of care. The CCI schema group is a fully normalized, multi-party model with 11 entities and 206 fields. This summary captures the key alignments, gaps, and recommendations.

Alignment Scorecard

Area	Status	Key Insight
Case ID & campaign link	✔ Good	Both reference a campaign
Campaign/Perf Lever depth	● Gap	CCI has health plan scoping + performance levers; v0625 has only <code>campaign_id</code>
Case name, type, status	● Structural	CCI moves these to CASE_PARTICIPANT (per-party); v0625 puts them on the root case
Alternate IDs	✔ Match	v0625's <code>alternate_case_identity[]</code> maps naturally to <code>CASE_PARTICIPANT</code> rows
Status history	● Different	v0625 uses an inline array; CCI splits into <code>status_state</code> + <code>participant status</code> + <code>CASE_LOG</code>
Organizations	✔ Good	v0625's <code>organization_identity[]</code> maps to <code>CASE_PARTICIPANT</code>
Member reference	● Different	v0625 puts member on root; CCI uses <code>CASE_ITEM</code> linking table
Workflow steps	✔ Structural match	Both model steps as arrays; field-level gaps exist
Per-step outcomes	● Gap	v0625 has per-step outcomes; CCI tracks at case level via <code>OUTCOME</code> entity
Supporting entities	● Gap	v0625 has no <code>TASK</code> , <code>FLAG</code> , <code>GOAL</code> , <code>INTERACTION</code> , <code>OUTCOME</code> , <code>CASE_ITEM</code> , <code>CASE_LOG</code> , <code>DOCUMENT_REFERENCE</code>

Key Structural Differences

Case Descriptors Live on CASE_PARTICIPANT, Not CASE

The most significant design difference. In CCI, each participating organization (Wellnecity, employer, vendor, TPA) gets its own `CASE_PARTICIPANT` row with its own case ID, name, type, status, and owner. The v0625 JSON puts these on the root case object.

v0625 pattern:

- `case_name` , `case_description_short` , `vendor_case_type` → root-level fields

CCI pattern:

- `case_participant_case_name` , `case_participant_case_description` ,
`case_participant_case_type` → per-party rows

Status is Separated Into Three Concerns

Concern	v0625	CCI
Lifecycle state	Mixed into <code>case_status[]</code> array	<code>CASE.status_state</code> (active/resolved)
Per-party status	Mixed into <code>case_status[]</code> array	<code>CASE_PARTICIPANT.case_participant_case_status</code>
Status history	<code>case_status[].case_status_as_of</code> timestamps	<code>CASE_LOG</code> entity (append-only audit trail)

Members Linked via CASE_ITEM, Not Direct FK

CCI uses the `CASE_ITEM` linking table (`item_type` = 'member') to associate members, MOIs, claims, prescriptions, and parent cases with a case. The v0625 JSON puts member directly on the root.

Workflow Step Comparison

v0625 Step Field	CCI CASE_WORKFLOW Field	Status
<code>step_n_owner</code>	<code>case_workflow_assigned_person_id</code>	● Name vs FK
<code>step_n_type</code>	<code>case_workflow_step_category</code>	✓ Aligned
<code>step_n_value</code>	<code>case_workflow_step_name</code>	✓ Aligned
<code>step_n_description</code>	<code>case_workflow_step_description</code>	✓ Aligned
<code>step_n_begin_date</code>	—	● Missing in CCI
<code>step_n_end_date</code>	<code>case_workflow_completed_date</code>	✓ Aligned
<code>step_n_as_of_date</code>	—	● Missing in CCI
<code>step_n_outcome_reason</code>	—	● Case-level in CCI
<code>step_n_outcome_savings</code>	—	● Case-level in CCI
—	<code>case_workflow_step_sequence</code>	● Missing in v0625
—	<code>case_workflow_step_status</code>	● Missing in v0625
—	<code>case_workflow_is_template</code>	● Missing in v0625

Recommendations

v0625 Fields That Could Enhance CCI

v0625 Field	Proposed CCI Enhancement
case_description_short	Add short/long description split to CASE_PARTICIPANT
step_n_begin_date	Add case_workflow_start_date to CASE_WORKFLOW
step_n_as_of_date	Add snapshot/as-of date to CASE_WORKFLOW for reporting
step_n_outcome_reason / step_n_outcome_savings	Consider per-step outcome tracking on CASE_WORKFLOW

CCI Entities v0625 Should Adopt

The v0625 sample covers only the CASE entity. A complete implementation would also need:

- **CASE_PARTICIPANT** — multi-party case descriptors (natural fit for v0625's `alternate_case_identity` and `organization_identity`)
- **CASE_WORKFLOW** — normalized workflow steps with sequence, status, and template tracking
- **CASE_ITEM** — linking table for members, MOIs, claims, prescriptions
- **CASE_LOG** — audit trail for status changes
- **TASK / FLAG / GOAL** — work queue items within a case
- **INTERACTION** — contact events
- **OUTCOME / SAVINGS_EVENT** — results and financial tracking
- **DOCUMENT_REFERENCE** — attached documents

Conclusion

The v0625 JSON and CCI schema are well-aligned at the conceptual level — both model campaigns, multi-party case identities, and workflow steps. The primary gaps are structural: CCI normalizes case descriptors onto CASE_PARTICIPANT, tracks status across three separate concerns, and links related data through dedicated entities (CASE_ITEM, CASE_LOG, TASK, etc.). The v0625 patterns for `alternate_case_identity` and `organization_identity` are a natural precursor to CASE_PARTICIPANT and can be adopted with minimal refactoring.

Source: [Case Entity JSON Schema v0625](#) vs [Campaigns, Cases & Interactions Schema Group](#) PR: [#12 — feat: add Campaigns, Cases & Interactions schema group](#)