



Practice Incentives Program eHealth Incentive Requirement 1 – Secure Messaging Capability

Technical Workshop #2 – Meeting Summary Melbourne 6th May 2009

Overview

The Second Technical Workshop on Secure Messaging was held at the Airport Hilton in Melbourne from 10am to 4.30pm on the 6 May 2009. NEHTA jointly hosted the workshop with MSIA. Representatives from 20 organisations from the medical software industry attended.

Presentations are available on the NEHTA website at www.nehta.gov.au/pip in the *Documents & Presentations* link.

The following is a summary of the sessions that were conducted on the day.

Introduction/Welcome

Tina Connell-Clark (NEHTA), Vince McCauley (MSIA)

Tina and Vince jointly chaired the workshop and welcomed participants.

The group was reminded that the pipwg@msia.com.au email list was a very active technical discussion group and members were encouraged to sign up as many staff as they felt necessary. Robust discussions were encouraged.

Gavan Lim-Joon (eClinic) appealed to the group to look at the big picture, as this was just a single project and a small step in the evolution of the industry. Department of Health and Ageing had a single requirement, "Secure Messaging", and to achieve that there will need to be some compromises. Gavan reminded everyone that as vendors are unfunded, these projects are often disruptive and compete with other pressing needs, and it is important that we don't get bogged down in technical detail or try to solve all ehealth issues.

Review of Summary of Actions from last meeting

Tina Connell-Clark (NEHTA), Vince McCauley (MSIA)

A review of the actions from the last meeting in Sydney on 8 April 2009 was conducted. Refer to *Appendix B* for a summary of the discussions and updates.

Scope

John McMillan (NEHTA) and Vince McCauley (MSIA)

Discussion about how to best report meetings – possibly need a public website version and a more technical detailed version. Possibly *Minutes* and *Findings*.

John McMillan presented the draft PIP Secure Messaging Scope for review.

Key Issues:

- Concern was expressed that the scope was limited to secure messaging where one of the participants, receiver or sender, must be a general practitioner. NEHTA can confirm that the PIP is



simply an incentive related to a Practice using products that conform with agreed NEHTA Secure Messaging specifications. Jared Davison (Medical-Objects) put the view that this process is about building infrastructure. Andrew Berry (NEHTA) said the scope should reflect what we are targeting and not a list of exclusions.

- Should the scope apply to messages to a specific healthcare organisation rather than a message repository? – if a repository was not included it would impact on eMedications
- Is the message destination to be an organisation or an individual? Agreed model should be organisation to organisation initially.
- Broadcast messages are to be excluded including “publish and subscribe” messages.
- Discussion on what level of “messaging” is within scope? Secure workflow level or secure message level. Agreed on “*Provision for reliable end to end messaging including intermediaries*”
- Discussion about large file limitations – decided to allow arbitrarily large files but provide explanation of possible limitations of using that capability through advice in implementation guides
- Discussion about email and similar common message traffic
- Discussion about query interaction traffic – the NEHTA position is separate Web Service Definition Language (WSDL). HL7 has some support for this already – removed from scope
- Discussion about security – which PKI certificate should be allowed, which trusted Certificate Authorities?
- Discussion about duty of care, must have more than just acknowledgement of message received - interface between workflow and business processes v. scope of secure message tracking
- Discussion about whether DOHA was funding or asking for interoperability – was the scope therefore appropriate.
- Defined scope will also be sent to DoHA
- NEHTA maintains the issues register.
- John McMillan will build a document from the revised scope presentation and post to pipwg@msia.com.au
- Andrew Berry presented a brief slide pack on NEHTA’s current thinking on potential technical use cases for Clinical Document Delivery (CDD)
 - Discussion around CDD – its direction, structured data templates for pathology. Separate WSDLs or not. Some believed that at the pre PIP planning meeting an undertaking was given that there would be a single unified messaging strategy, a single message artifact
- Concerns raised about PIP single secure messaging message approach and the CDD message approach. NEHTA needs to provide reasons for a different path. Vendors don’t want to do things twice over.
- John McMillan agreed to take the issue to NEHTA architecture forums and report back to the PIP Working Group

TECHNICAL USE CASE

Andrew Shrosbee (NEHTA)

Andrew walked the group through the four (4) use cases for direct messaging.

Issues:

The strawman model does not support an immediate synchronous response.

Guaranteed order of delivery discussion – many views were expressed. Issues about session / synchronous / asynchronous / unit of work definitions and other guaranteed order of delivery issues were ‘parked’ for discussion in the future.

How many degrees of intermediation could be realistically supported?

What happens if the return path is significantly different to the forward message path?

How does a receiver know where to send an acknowledgement?



Summary and What If's

Tina Connell-Clark (NEHTA)

Is Connect-a-thon participation appropriate or too costly for vendors?
Can the secure messaging specification be finished by September, 2009?
Do we need specialised Technical working groups?
What should the project milestones be?
When should Standards Australia be involved in the PIP process?
What are the deliverables?

Next Steps

- Feed back on WIKI /collaborative portal by 22 May (NEHTA)
- Next WG in Sydney on 4 June with agenda items:
 - Action Items follow up
 - Scope review
 - Business use cases and Business requirements to be circulated prior to meeting
 - Privacy Issues
 - Technology v implementation issues
 - HISA/HIC plenary on PIP secure messaging

Need to use mailing list more - short and pithy points

Further tentative PIP Working Group dates

25 June 2009 Sydney
23 July 2009 Sydney
18 Aug 2009 Canberra (possibly prior to HIC?)
16 Sept 2009 Sydney

Closure

Meeting closed at 4.30pm



**Appendix A
Attendance List**

Organisation	Individual	Role
ACCS	Ben Miller	Documentations Support
Argus Connect International	Julia Davis	Business Analyst
Australian Healthcare Messaging Laboratory (AHML)	Jane Gilbert	Director
Cerner	Tony Hennessy	Senior Manager, Technology
CSN Technology	Brett Avery	Solution Architect
eClinic	Gavan Lim-Joon	Chief Technical Officer
Global Health	Katie Nelson	Hospital Systems
Health Connection Network	Staffan Flodin	Software Development Director
Healthlink	Lars Becker	Manager Strategic Projects Product Manager Messaging
iSoft	Paul Doman	Operations Manager, Primary Care
Key Trust Group	Paul Arch	Director
LRS Health	Glen Kleidon	Senior Software Engineer
Medical-Objects	Jared Davison	Senior Software Engineer
MSIA	Bridget Kirkham	CEO
MSIA	Vince McCauley	President
MedTechGlobal	Dhruv Sisodia	Product Manager
Microsoft	James Kavanagh	eHealth Architect
NEHTA	Andrew Berry	Solution Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	Andrew Shrosbree	Integration Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	Bill Bolton	Technical Advisor, UHI
NEHTA	David Manfield	Manager, CCA
NEHTA	David Nissen	Technical Manager, NASH
NEHTA	Hoylen Sue	Technical Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	John McMillan	Manager, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	Tina Connell-Clark	Manager, Standards
Orion Health	John Allinson	Project Manager
Pro Medicus	Steve Williams	R&D Manager
Rouesnel	Lawrence Rousnel	Director
Smart Health Solutions	Jon Hughes	IT Director
Sonic Healthcare	Bryan Jones	Informatics Manager
Stat Health Systems	Cameron Jaffrey	Director Development



Appendix B
Summary of Actions

No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
1.	Terms of Reference for workshop is required	Tina, MSIA	Needs further work especially with respect to who should be involved (see 5 below)	
2.	Organisation Chart for NEHTA to be distributed	Paul B	Draft Organisation chart is in circulation within NEHTA management for review. Will post when made available.	
3.	Phone list for NEHTA staff to be distributed	Tina	NEHTA staff phone list posted on PIPWG	9/4/09 Complete
4.	AIIA members didn't get distributed an invitation? Requires followup	Bridget	Engagement of AIIA members – reminder email sent to appropriate contact, no response as yet	
5.	Follow up with those suppliers who have signed Statement of Commitment but who are not participating in workshops is required.	Bridget, Paul B	Follow up with those suppliers who have signed a Statement of Commitment. Noted that the number of those who have signed has grown from 24 to 38. Bridget Kirkham, MSIA had contacted them all with details of how to join PIPWG and alerted them to the NEHTA uploads of minutes, presentations etc. Some concern was expressed as to whether contributing via the PIPWG was enough. Vince McCauley, asked for better guidelines as to who/how to engage. Discussion about the appropriate eligibility criteria for participation in Technical WG. Were all signed suppliers on NEHTA list appropriate attendees at the working group, as it was already in place and already very large. John McMillan said the intent was not to have it open to everyone who wished to attend but consider a case by case basis. Paul Doman reported that it had been agreed at an earlier, pre WG meeting that eligibility (for the TWG?) should include those with PMS, PAS, or some form of messaging service rather than just any company that may be impacted by the PIP secure messaging process. As agreed at the previous meeting, only one representative from each company should attend. James Kavanagh, Microsoft reiterated the importance infrastructure vendors being involved. Paul Burnham NEHTA, and Bridget Kirkham MSIA are to review the list with a view to developing eligibility criteria	
6.	Workshop summaries and presentations to be loaded onto	Paul B	Loaded onto website	17/4/09 Complete



No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
	NEHTA website, advised to attendees			
7.	Endpoint Location Service (ELS) specs to be put up on website and circulated to workshop attendees	John Mc	ELS specs will be uploaded and the source code will be available "soon"	
8.	Consideration for Travel Expenses to be reimbursed for up to 15 members (rather than current 10).	Tina/Paul B	Travel reimbursement for vendors is available for 10 x MSIA endorsed representatives.	25/5/09 Closed
9.	Investigation of existing conformance/compliance approaches required	David M	David Manfield, NEHTA reported that NEHTA Board has approved the CCA program at its February 2009 meeting. The intention is for NEHTA not to be a testing entity. Industry test capability is an issue for CCA and an initial environmental scan of industry test capability has been done. The CCA project has been resourced in April with a set of staff and PIP is the top priority. In aid of the PIP consultation, the CCA team is producing a compliance and testing framework to describe the topics we feel it will be useful to discuss including the means of testing. IHE provides an industry community for testing separate to formal conformance testing, and vendors will make use of this opportunity according to their own business decisions. Best outcomes are achieved where the subject of IHE is the specification arising from this consultation and anticipated Standards Australia process.	6/5/09 Closed
10.	Collaborative Portal is being developed by NEHTA for working with industry. Information to be distributed to workshop attendees.	John Mc	The NEHTA collaborative portal is being developed by NEHTA for working with industry but John McMillan reported that it is taking longer than expected and is presently limited to the SRGs (Stakeholder Reference Groups). The PIP Secure Messaging WG is expected to be the next to go live.	
11.	Clarification on how PIP payment is administered. If supplier drops off Eligible Supplier list what are the implications for the practice, eg quarterly assessment? Clarification from DoHA required.	Paul B	Department of Health and Ageing advise that eligibility is currently based on participation in the consultation process (direct or via MSIA). DoHA advise that it is unlikely that a Supplier would be removed and will look into the issue if the particular circumstances arise.	16/5/09 Closed
12.	Each supplier is invited to send an overview of their secure messaging solution to pipwg@msia.com.au	All suppliers	Each supplier was asked to provide a summary of their secure messaging solution. John McMillan said that NEHTA recognised that this was a brownfield situation. NEHTA wanted to understand better the "current state" of secure messaging capabilities; and to understand the impact of proposed and develop appropriate transition paths into a standardised e-health secure communications architecture. NEHTA to produce a summary.	



No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
13.	Clarification of PIP secure messaging scope and requirements in comparison with NEHTA solution specifications	John Mc Next Workshop	Discussed at 6 May workshop, will be clarified into scope document.	
14.	Clarification over documents, messages, acknowledgements and use cases required, ie the language used for describing these	John Mc	Discussed at 6 May workshop, will be clarified into scope document.	
15.	Use Case definitions and Business Requirements needs more discussion	John Mc	To be further discussed	
16.	Complexity with double encryption at transport layer and payload needs to be considered. Simpler option requested between trusted parties.	John Mc	To be further discussed	
17.	Role of Contracted Service Provider to be explored more. Privacy requirements to be clarified. Includes encryption approach.	John Mc	To be further discussed	
18.	Real time (synchronous) responses and messaging needs to be catered for.	John Mc	To be further discussed	
19.	Standards Australia to be involved in ongoing process	Tina	Tina appointed as Standards Manager at NEHTA.	
20.	Privacy Requirements	John Mc	John McMillan reported that NEHTA had engaged an independent 3 rd party consultant who would be providing a report by the next working group. It was hoped Peter Croll could also attend the next working group.	