

Interoperability Questions and Issues: Assessing Implications of the NAACCR Clinical Data Interoperability Pilot Project

2010 NAACCR Annual Meeting
Quebec City, Quebec, Canada
June 21 – 25, 2010

Jim Martin, Ph.D.
Director, Virginia Cancer Registry
Richmond, Virginia

Interoperability hurtsss
poor SMESMO!!
Yesss, hurtsss!!



The NAACCR Charge

Examine transmitting cancer abstracts:

- hospitals ↔ central registries
- **not** ccr ↔ nat'l programs

Consider transmitting data to entities outside cancer surveillance community

Attend to interoperability issues (NAACCR priority)

1. Issues

June 24, 2010

2010 NAACCR Annual Meeting, Quebec
City

4

1.1. Size & Processing Time

CDA format 5 x \leftrightarrow 20 x > v11.3 or v12

- Larger size = longer processing time.
- Project focus was accuracy, **not** size
 - Could reduce size \approx 10% \leftrightarrow 15%
 - Remove optional elements

1.2. Batch vs. Individual Records

CDA: One record = one file

- Makes sense in real-time, clinical environment
- Example: transmit a discharge summary

CCR: Multiple records = one file

- Makes sense in surveillance environment
- Flexibility essential ($1 \leftrightarrow < \infty$ records)

1.3. State CCR ↔ National Programs

CDA submission:

- $\geq 100,000 \rightarrow 2,000,000$ **files, 1 / record**

Test

- 500,000 files
- Zipping: 10x \rightarrow 20x longer (CDA overhead)
- Not economical for CCR

1.4. Develop an Editor

Current standard

- Simple
- Proprietary flat file record

CDA options:

- Custom XML editor
- Web-based tool (e.g., Xforms)
- Non-proprietary as is, customizable

1.5. CDA Maintenance Resources

CDA development costs not trivial

Documenting and versioning

- E.g., v12 and beyond?
- Non-standard items (e.g., state)
- CDA object identifier (OIDs) codes

2. Recommendations

June 24, 2010

2010 NAACCR Annual Meeting, Quebec
City

10

2.1. CD WG Activity

Explore alternate file formats

Explore editing and transformation tools

Monitor national standards

- Interoperability
- Electronic transmission

2.2. A Board Request

Examine XML options (send / receive)

- Hospitals ↔ CCR
- Non-hospital reporters ↔ CCR
- CCR ↔ NAACCR, NPCR, SEER & CoC
- “Green CDA” (mini-CDA)
 - Batch record capability
 - Processing overhead

Feasibility of a NAACCR XML?

2.3. CD WG Next Steps

Explore & select alternate (national) XML format

Develop project proposal

- Scope-of-work
- Budget
- Subject matter experts, as necessary

2.4. Collaborate

Focus on interoperable surveillance systems

NAACCR and:

- Sponsoring member organizations
- Cancer registry software vendors
- EMR/EHR vendors

Understand Federal EMR/EHR initiatives

Contribute to public & private standards
development

3. Next Steps

June 24, 2010

2010 NAACCR Annual Meeting, Quebec
City

15

3.1. CD WG Current Work

Developing basic XML requirements document

- Interoperability requirements
- Address / avoid CDA issues
- Define test data set
- Expand # of pilot sites by 1

Defining phase 2 proposal for NAACCR Board

Working with subject matter experts

3.2.1. Surveillance Partners

- American Cancer Society
- American College of Surgeons
- American Joint Commission on Cancer
- Canadian Partnership Against Cancer
- CDC National Program of Cancer Registries
- College of American Pathologists
- National Cancer Institute
- National Cancer Registrars Association
- Public Health Agency of Canada

3.2.2.1. Non-Surveillance Partners

American National Standards Institute, Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) X12

- Electronic data interchange (EDI) standards
- Healthcare Information Technology Standards Panel (HITSP)
 - Public – private partnership
 - Harmonizes / integrates clinical & business standards

3.2.2.2. Non-Surveillance Partners

Health Level 7 (HL 7)

- Develops framework and standards for information exchange, integration, sharing, and retrieval
- Supports clinical practice and managing, delivering, and evaluating health services

3.2.2.3. Non-Surveillance Partners

Integrating the Healthcare Enterprise (IHE)

- Purpose: create interoperable information transmission frameworks
- Work: define, test, and implement standards-based electronic health records interoperability

3.2.2.4. Non-Surveillance Partners

Public Health Data Standards Consortium (PHDSC)

- Public / private consortium:
 - Public health IT standards for individual and community health
 - Advocate for IT standards to benefit healthcare and population health

Lucky, lucky SMESMO!
Interoperability! Yesss!
So preciousss!!”



June 24, 2010

2010 NAACCR Annual Meeting, Quebec
City

22

Acknowledgments

The NAACCR Clinical Data Work Group receives financial support from NAACCR. NAACCR receives financial support from the CDC National Program of Cancer Registries, grant # 5U13DP000661, and from the National Cancer Institute, grant # 5R13CA091824.