



Practice Incentives Program eHealth Incentive Requirement 1 – Secure Messaging Capability

Technical Workshop #3 – Meeting Summary Sydney 4th June 2009

OVERVIEW

The 3rd Technical Workshop on Secure Messaging was held at the Stamford Plaza at Sydney Airport from 9.30am to 4.30pm on the 4 June 2009. NEHTA jointly hosted the workshop with MSIA. Representatives from 15 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. Note that a number of interstate delegates were delayed in getting to the workshop due to the fog at Sydney Airport. Elements of the agenda needed to be adjusted to accommodate late arrivals.

COLLABORATION PORTAL/SHARING INFORMATION

John McMillan (NEHTA)

John gave an update on the NEHTA Collaboration Portal:

- Collaboration Portal is now undergoing testing. Requires registration and only endorsed individuals will be included.
- Allows community to edit, share and comment on documents.
- Different to www.nehta.gov.au/pip area on NEHTA web site, which contains more formal documents.
- Agreed that collaboration portal will have some form of membership.
- Email list pipwg@msia.com.au will remain the channel for sharing text.
- Agreement for pipwg@msia.com.au email list of participants to be provided to NEHTA for setting up the portal.
- Request that email notification is sent to pipwg@msia.com.au when new versions of documents are posted to the portal



TERMS OF REFERENCE

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

Vince and Tina lead the discussion on the Terms of Reference document:

- Agreement to put NEHTA and MSIA logo on document. Vince/Bridget will approach AIIA for their input.
- Co-chairs of Vince and Tina were unanimously elected.
- Question raised over what 'consensus' is, as the specification will end up going to IT-14 Working Group – agreed that a practical definition of consensus meant agreement by 80% of the group
- Membership needs to be reviewed. Questions around what participation is.
- Gavan (eClinic) to send Intellectual Property disclaimers to Tina for inclusion

SCOPE

John McMillan (NEHTA), Vince McCauley (MSIA)

John presented on the Purpose and Scope document:

- Scope section of document agreed after some minor amendments
- Assumptions section may need to be changed after review of "parked" items
- Discussion about possible need for addressing messages to an individual, so references to 'Organisation' changed to 'End Points'.
- Section of document dealing with future state and transition path will need more work
- Purpose and Scope document to posted to collaboration portal

PRIVACY

Peter Croll (NEHTA), Vince McCauley (MSIA)

Peter Croll presented on Privacy and the considerations for Secure Messaging. Topics included:

- Good Practice versus what is legal
- Reasonable steps to secure information
- Healthcare organization only uses/discloses for primary purpose
- Sensitive information should only be disclosed where patient would reasonably expect it
- Sensitive information requires specific consent

Issues:

- Much discussion regarding whether privacy requirements regarding messaging would be satisfied only by end-to-end encryption or whether it was sufficient to encrypt for each hop in a multi-hop process, supported by bi-lateral agreements – issue referred to technical sub-group to propose solution(s) to be submitted to privacy review
- Practice versus single Doctor consent
- Commonwealth obligation to prevent laws being breached
- Passing information overseas, eg backup. Requires comparable laws if the data can be decrypted whilst being overseas. If it cannot be decrypted overseas then there seems to be no problem.



PROPOSED TRANSPORT via CLINICAL DOCUMENT DELIVERY (CDD)

Andrew Berry (NEHTA)

Andrew presented on the generic interface (Clinical Document Delivery) and explained relationship to the domain-specific interfaces being developed by NEHTA:

- CDD is a generic payload transport method and will be available for all domain types – targeted at messaging vendors.
- Specific domains such as Pathology, Discharge Summary will have specific interfaces in the future for the purpose of application to application communication.
- Pathology interface is currently in draft and is a specific interface.
- Possible pathway is to have translation from specific interface to CDD (and transfer back)
- NEHTA could define transformation modules for every package, so that all would be able to utilise CDD for transport.

Issues:

- Existing standards exist, request to reuse current approaches
- Request that NEHTA outlines which domain areas will have specific interfaces.
- Timelines for CDD interface and how long it will be applicable for before the other specific interfaces come into play and need to be implemented
- Clarification on domain specific and generic interfaces and how they will operate
- Lars (HealthLink) and Gavan (eClinic) asked for solutions/profiles that did not include end-to-end encryption yet entailed secure delivery as this represented existing industry usage. End-to-end encryption has a very large impact on some existing vendors (e.g. intermediaries).

SUB-COMMITTEE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

Tina Connell-Clark (NEHTA)

Tina proposed a schedule for completing the specifications for the eHealth PIP, followed by passage through IT-014, in sufficient time for a possible IHE connectathon around March 2010.

The concept of a smaller agile technical group was tabled by Tina and supported. A sub-committee to focus on the technical secure messaging specifications will be formed.

Nominations for the sub-committee were received from Jared Davison (Medical Objects), Staffan Flodin (HCN), Julia Davis (for Phil from ArgusConnect), Katie Nelson (for Tim from Global Health), Jon Hughes (for Larry from SmartHealth), Gavan (for Leigh from eClinic), Lars Becker (Healthlink), Paul Arch (for Bennett from KeyTrust). It was also suggested that Glen Kleidon from (LRS) would be a good candidate to approach.

It was agreed that MSIA would review the nominations in consultation with NEHTA, ideally up to a maximum of seven industry delegates. A condition of entry to the sub-committee technical group is that they must be familiar with the current program of work and to have contributed to the ongoing discussions.

This sub-committee will work on the detailed technical secure messaging issues. The group will table their findings to the larger working group.

As the Secure Messaging specifications are close to reaching consensus, a joint update to vendor senior management was suggested by Gavan (eClinic) in order to promote stakeholder support and buy-in.



Lars Becker suggested that we constrain the scope of the deliverables to be produced by September to an extent that makes it more likely to meet the September deadline. He proposed that one approach could be to focus on defining what constitutes a secure messaging service (instead of trying to define a larger standard for messaging system interconnection). This would match DoHA's PIP statements. The interconnection standard (aka CDD specification) could be worked on within a more spacious timeframe.

Vince indicated that MSIA were hoping to secure funds that would act as an incentive for vendors to adopt the specifications early.

Proposed 1st Technical Sub-Committee Workshop will be in Sydney on 16th June, 9am – 4.30pm

Proposed topics:

- Delivery Responses,
- Status Query
- S/MIME vs XSP
- Identification
- End to End Security vs Multiple Hops
- Intermediary/Privacy
- XDR

Issues:

- MSIA requested a 'sitting fee' for members of the Sub-Committee Technical Working Group. MSIA will write to NEHTA to formalise this request.
- Concern was expressed about XDR being proposed despite there having been no discussion on the mailing list prior to the workshop. It will be accorded the priority required for its inclusion at the technical workshop if it gains traction on the mailing list.

IDENTIFYING PAYLOADS

Andrew Shrosbree (NEHTA)

Andrew spoke about payload identification:

- Specific payload definition remains beyond the scope of this group.
- Need to be able to do message process based on the type of payload.
- MSIA may look at Standard Committee to endorse a list of formats, e.g. Pathology and Referrals.
- ELS may be used to retrieve an identifier for the payload a site is expecting.
- Expectation that HL7 version 2 messages to be the main formats in the beginning.
- Attendees agreed to collect a list of the payloads already in use, and to submit these to Jane Gilbert (AHML) who will collate a set of payloads in use.

END POINT LOCATION SERVICE

Andrew Shrosbree (NEHTA)

Andrew presented on the End Point Location Service:

- NEHTA will publish source code for its ELS implementation
- NEHTA may host an ELS, but also option for private ELS operators.

Issues:

- Adding entries to ELS is currently manual. Request for the endpoints to be able to do this automatically



RESPONSES

Hoylen Sue (NEHTA)

Hoylen presented on Responses:

- Delivery responses, Application responses.
- Proposed two interfaces, Immediate and Deferred
- Staffan proposed need to handle situation where recipient has low polling frequency and sender has high retry frequency
- Status messages (acknowledgements) vs status queries – depended on whether requirement was to know the status of all messages or just specific messages when there was a query re status (eg when there was a delivery problem)
- Issue of acknowledgements referred to sub-committee

IDENTIFIERS

Andrew Shrosbree (NEHTA)

Andrew presented on Health Identifiers:

- Normally use Organisation Name to retrieve Identifier from Unique Health Identifier service (Medicare), then go to Endpoint Locator Service to find end-point and retrieve certificate – however would need alternative process until UHI and NASH are operational (expected to be in 2010)
- Andrew presented possible mechanisms for interim infrastructure using existing directories and identifiers embedded in Medicare certificates.
- Using Medicare as a lookup directory in lieu of UHI identified as potentially inadequate.
- An alternative idea was floated, in which custodians of directories (e.g. DHS Vic, ArgusConnect, Medical Objects, HpRY) expose their directories using a UHI interface.
- Use cases were presented to show how both client and server-based software might conduct round-robin queries of such open directories.

Issues:

- Gavan questioned whether the effort of building an alternative solution for identifiers was necessary if there would be only a short period of time till the national infrastructure services become operational.
- Vince proposed use of HL7's EIS as a front end to individual queries on each vendor's directory.

NEXT STEPS

Tina Connell-Clark (NEHTA)

Secure Messaging Technical Sub-Committee date

16 June 2009 Sydney **Proposed**

Secure Messaging Working Group dates

25 June 2009 Sydney (agenda to be devoted to technical issues)

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
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
Medical-Objects	Jared Davison	Senior Software Engineer
MSIA	Bridget Kirkham	CEO
MSIA	Vince McCauley	President
NEHTA	Andrew Berry	Solution Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	Andrew Shrosbree	Integration Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	David Nissen	Technical Manager, NASH
NEHTA	Hoylen Sue	Technical Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	John McMillan	Manager, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	Paul Burnham	Manager, Reference Platform
NEHTA	Peter Croll	Consultant
NEHTA	Roger Hewitt	Manager, Solutions Adoption
NEHTA	Tina Connell-Clark	Manager, Standards
Pen Computing	Tarkan Shahho	Pen Computing
Rouesnel Software	Laurence Rousnel	Director
Smart Health Solutions	Jon Hughes	IT Director
Sonic Healthcare	Bryan Jones	Informatics Manager



Appendix B
Summary of Actions

No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
1.	Terms of Reference for workshop is required	Tina, MSIA	Tabled and requires minor amendments before acceptance.	
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 / Vince	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	4/6/09 Complete
6.	Workshop summaries and presentations to be loaded onto	Paul B	Loaded onto website	17/4/09



No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
	NEHTA website, advised to attendees			Complete
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	Portal is now undergoing testing.	
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	



No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
			summary.	
13.	Clarification of PIP secure messaging scope and requirements in comparison with NEHTA solution specifications	John Mc	Discussed at 6 May workshop, will be clarified into scope document. Scope document presented at 4 June workshop - will be posted to collaboration portal and refined further. The relationship between the specifications being developed by NEHTA for other eHealth domains and the PIP secure messaging solution was also presented at the 4 June workshop.	4/6/2009 Closed
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.	4/6/2009 Closed
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	Privacy advice presented to 4 June workshop. Referred to technical sub-group for discussion of possible responses. To be further discussed	
17.	Role of Contracted Service Provider to be explored more. Privacy requirements to be clarified. Includes encryption approach.	John Mc	Privacy advice presented to 4 June workshop. Referred to technical sub-group for discussion of possible responses. To be further discussed	
18.	Real time (synchronous) responses and messaging needs to be catered for.	John Mc	Referred to technical sub-group - To be further discussed	
19.	Standards Australia to be involved in ongoing process	Tina	Tina appointed as Standards Manager at NEHTA.	Closed
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. Presented at 4 June.	4/6/2009 Closed



No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
21.	Intellectual Property rights regarding members contributions to specifications which result from PIP WG	Gavan	Gavan to email proposed IP clause to Tina. NEHTA to obtain legal review	
22.	Need to identify payload types currently being transmitted	All suppliers	Attendees to submit payloads already in use to Jane Gilbert (AHML) who will collate and maintain list	