

## Connectathon Notes – Apr 7 2017 – ITI FHIR-based profiles

Approximately 21 developers and monitors met for about 30 minutes on Thursday during the EU Connectathon to provide feedback on the FHIR-based profiles and associated tests

### PDQm

- Some servers are still returning a 404 for 'not found' rather than 200 with an empty bundle
- One suggestion was to model the optional PDQm query parameters as was done in the PAM profile, ie the PDQm Consumer would declare an option for each query parameter that was supported. This enables purchasers to easily identify what a Consumer supports. This would imply a similar update to PDQv2 & v3

### MHD

- The problems identified in the open MHD CPs are still a problem and need to be addressed in the next update
- The ITI TC needs to provide documentation that covers three deployment scenarios:
  1. MHD standalone
  2. MHD-XDS
    - a. There are gaps in mappings between translating MHD to XDS.
    - b. There are no equivalent capabilities in MHD for some XDS queries. **Bill asked for input on the subset of queries that would be most useful**
    - c. There is also a problem with data types, eg document identifier can be a string in MHD, but in XDS it is an OID.
    - d. Suggestion to add an option with additional requirements for MHD actors with an XDS infrastructure behind
    - e. Or, perhaps there should be a different actor name for an XDS-enabled Consumer, Responder....
  3. MHD-XCA
    - a. Nothing specifically discussed on this deployment scenario
- Being more explicit in MHD profile documentation will make the profile easier to implement and will also enable using a product's Integration Statement to determine compliance
- ITI-65 – (Provide) →
  - If you have an XDS Reg/Rep behind, codes are required, but this is not required in ITI-65.
- ITI-66/67 →

- For Doc References & Manifest it is not explicitly stated that we support a GET (like PDQm), but that does not exist in MHD

Lynn 4/11/2017 4:23 PM

**Comment [1]:** This is what I wrote, but it does not make sense to me...Mauro? Bill? ...can you clarify from your memory?

### **PIXm**

- Suggestion to deprecate the profile and provide the functionality within PDQm
- The functionality is entirely there w/in PDQm, but the fuller demographics would be returned
- Is XCPD a model for this?

### **Appendix Z**

- Make the documentation of \_format unambiguous for both the client and server

### **ATNA Query**

- ITI-81 – the identifier in the returned ATNA record (ieAuditEvent) is not mandatory, so it cannot be retrieved. – CP needed

### **Connectathon specific**

- Gazelle should require every endpoint would publish a Conformance Resource.
- PDQm – tests are tedious to verify due to large number of optional query parameters

### **Tool requirements**

- JSON validator needed
- FHIR simulators – link to XDS tools even if the FHIR tooling does not originate from NIST

### **Outside the meeting**

- There was some minor grumbling about the challenges of testing DSTU2 when some have already moved to STU3-based toolkits