**SuperApp – Plan Document-Related Specification**

**Scope:** This section isolates all references to *plan documents* (as distinct from ID cards) and interprets the current architectural thinking, system implications, and stakeholder discussions.

**1. Plan Documents – Direct Mentions**

After a full scan of the chat content, **plan documents themselves are not discussed in any significant depth**, but there are **indirect implications and gaps**, particularly from this reference:

**“not all ID cards return with plan Name, PlanSponsorName (we may want to source that from app startup)”**  
— *Patel, Harshal K, 5/29 3:04 PM*

**Interpretation:**

* Although this line is about ID cards, it implies that **some plan-level metadata (e.g., Name, Sponsor Name)** may be **missing** or inconsistently populated in the source data.
* To mitigate this, **sourcing from app startup** suggests the idea of **loading static or semi-static plan document metadata** into memory or cache at runtime to **augment missing fields**.
* This raises architectural considerations around the **source of truth for plan metadata**, potentially a *central plan document store or service* not otherwise described in the chat.

**2. Inferred Plan Document Strategy**

Even though the chat does not mention explicit *plan documents* like SBCs (Summary of Benefits & Coverage), EOCs (Evidence of Coverage), formularies, or network PDFs, the following **assumptions and implications** can be reasonably inferred:

**2.1 Need for Centralized Metadata**

* The reference to “app startup” sourcing of planName and planSponsorName suggests:
  + The system may benefit from a **central repository of plan document metadata**.
  + This could serve both ID card and plan document UIs or APIs.

**2.2 Implicit Gap in Data Quality**

* The inconsistency in plan-related fields indicates **a quality or completeness gap** in upstream plan systems.
* This suggests any system surfacing plan documents will need to **validate or normalize** metadata prior to user-facing presentation.

**2.3 InterOp and Plan Exposure**

* In the **InterOp discussion**, Tang mentions:

“Interop - FHIR and implementing to that standard is their bread and butter”  
“I think there are new regs coming that will require more data exposed that Interop will handle.”

**Implication:**

* Plan documents may eventually need to be exposed through **FHIR-compliant APIs** to satisfy **CMS or ONC interoperability regulations** (e.g., payer-to-payer data exchange).
* While not explicitly discussed, this regulatory push would apply more broadly to **coverage and benefits documents** — not just ID cards.

**3. Current Gaps and Action Items**

| **Topic** | **Observation / Gap** | **Action Needed** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Plan Document Metadata Availability | Plan Name and Sponsor are inconsistently populated | Evaluate sourcing from a plan doc index or API |
| InterOp Alignment for Plan Content | No existing integration with InterOp for plan docs; new regs may change that | Connect with InterOp team to assess scope |
| Document Surfacing Strategy | No architecture or MVP feature description for actual plan documents surfaced | Define requirements for plan document access (e.g., PDFs, summaries) |