

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

## 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_timestamps</code>	<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](#)