



Template for

<<Title of Use Case>>

Standards Gap and Overlap Analysis

<<Date>>

<<Version 0.5>

**Office of the National Coordinator for
Health Information Technology (ONC)**

Preface: How to use this template

This document is a template designed for the purpose of standardizing the documented results of the work of the HITSP Technical Committee. This document is the first of several documents that, when taken as a whole, will represent Implementation Instructions. This first segment of the documentation pertains to the list of standards required to implement the events in a specific Use Case, and the identification of gaps and overlaps in the standards that are required.

This document contains instructions and guidelines which are written in blue italicized font. These should be deleted when using the template to create the final deliverable.

*The **black unitalicized text** represents headers that should remain as you convert the template to the specific Gap and Overlap Analysis for each use case.*

In some pages you will find double brackets with indicated titles or words inside, for example <<Name goes here>>. You should delete the brackets for your final draft and insert the appropriate information in the suggested font.

Finally, this preface should be deleted.

Additional Note:

The template includes additional clarification based on the peer review.

Table of Contents

1. USE CASE GAP AND OVERLAP ANALYSIS REVISION HISTORY TABLE.....	4
2. INTRODUCTION.....	5
3. THE POOL OF STANDARDS REQUIRED BY THE USE CASE.....	5
A. SUMMARY OF STANDARDS.....	6
B. STANDARDS BY USE CASE.....	7
4. ASSUMPTIONS MADE IN CREATING THE POOL OF STANDARDS.....	1
5. USE CASE OPEN ISSUES.....	1
6. DUPLICATIONS AND OVERLAPS IN STANDARDS.....	1
7. GAPS IN STANDARDS.....	2
8. STANDARDS TO BE PROFILED IN IMPLEMENTATION GUIDES.....	2
9. RESOLUTION RECOMMENDATIONS.....	2
10. NEXT STEPS.....	3
11. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS.....	3
APPENDIX A - <<TITLE OF USE CASE>>.....	5
APPENDIX B – HITSP TAXONOMY OF HEALTH STANDARDS.....	5
APPENDIX C – STANDARDS READINESS LEVEL 1 ANALYSIS.....	5

1. Use Case Gap and Overlap Analysis Revision History Table

Version Number	Description of Change	Name of Author	Date Published
<i>Identify V#</i>	<i>Provide details of each update here to help others in the organization follow changes</i>	<i>Name of the person who actually made the changes</i>	<i>Date the version was finalized</i>

Assigning Versions Numbers should be done in a consistent manner. Each major new version of a document should be assigned a new Version Number (i.e., V1.0, V2.0, V3.0, etc).

Every minor adjustment made to the document should result in an increased sub-version number represented by the number following the decimal point (i.e., V1.1, V1.2, V1.3, V1.4, V1.5, etc).

2. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to communicate to the Health Information Technology Standards Panel (HITSP) the results of the work of the HITSP Technical Committee for << Use Case Name>>. The Technical Committee was charged with identifying and analyzing gaps and duplications within the standards industry as they relate to the events in this Use Case. Specifically, each Technical Committee has:

- Provided a listing of all standards that satisfy the requirements imposed by the Use Case
- Provided a listing of all assumptions made in creating the pool of standards.
- Provided a listing of Use Case open issues identified while developing the pool of standards.
- Provided a description of all duplications and overlaps among standards for the Use case
- Provided a description of the gaps, including missing or incomplete standards
- Submitted recommendations for resolving the gaps and overlaps to the HITSP for review, approval, and resolution.

The information in this document pertains to the following Use Case.

<< Include the description of the use case taken from the final AHIC Use Case. It is repeated here to provide context for the reader of this document. It should not be altered from the original text. An example of what it may look like --- Transmit essential data on ambulatory care and ED visit, resource utilization, and lab result data from electronically enabled health care delivery and public health systems can be transmitted in standardized and anonymized format to authorized public health agencies within 24 hours.>>

<< Include a very concise synopsis of the events and perspectives in the use case. For example, The Biosurveillance Use Case represents five unique perspectives: 1) Healthcare Provider, 2) Local Public Health Department, 3) State and Federal Public Health Agencies, 4) Consumer/Public, and 5) Resource Supplier. Each perspective includes three events: 1) Populate the information system, 2) detect a threat, and 3) monitor active threats.>>

The complete << Use Case Name>> is provided as Appendix A to this document.

3. The Pool of Standards Required by the Use Case

This section presents the standards required to support each major Use Case event and organizes the standards within an agreed upon standards taxonomy. The definition and examples of each category in the taxonomy are provided in Appendix B to this document. The standards selected for inclusion in the pool were examined using HITSP approved Harmonization Readiness Characteristics depicted below.

A graphical representation of the approved work of the Readiness Characteristics Committee will be inserted into this template.

Any standard that was considered and disqualified from consideration based on the Readiness Characteristics are documented in Appendix C of this document.

a. Summary of Standards

This section lists a summary of the standards that will be further refined in the next subsection. This section will list each standard considered in the context of the standards taxonomy. In this section, a standard will appear at most one time in any particular category. In the detailed section to follow, a standard may appear multiple times in a category if that is appropriate to support multiple actions/transactions identified in the use case.

<<The following is an example only. Each committee will insert the applicable list of standards.>>

Table 1: Standard Summary

Category	Standard	Version/Date <<The date represents the date when the standard was approved>>	References
Information Model	HL7 RIM	2.07 (December 9, 2004)	
	ANSI 1000-1039-ADA		
	ASTM 1239-1784		
Information Interchange	DICOM	3.0 (2004)	
	HL7	2.5	
	HL7	V3	
	X12 Business standards	...	
	NCPDP		
	ebXML		
Terminology	ICD		
	CPT		
	LOINC		
	RxNorm		
Security	TLS		
	HTTPS		
	WSS		
	SAML		
Identifier (Individual and Organizational)	FEIN		
	HIPAA National Provider Identifier		
	Payor Identifier		
	ISO Draft Standards		<<reference to specific standards>>
Functionality and Process Workflow	Clinical Guidelines		<<reference to specific standards>>
Technology Standards	SOA	WebServices	

b. Standards by Use Case

The table in Exhibit 1 lists the standards required for <<Use Case Name>> at the detailed level of each event identified in the use case and each action/transaction identified by the Technical Committee.

Exhibit 1 – Pool of Standards Required for <<Use Case Name>>

<<This table contains examples only. Each committee will include the applicable standards per event using this table as an example.>>

	Standard Categories	Context (Information Model)	Information Interchange	Terminology	Security & Privacy	Identifier (Individual and Organization)	Functionality & Process Workflow	Other
	<i>Example Standards for category</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>HL7 RIM</i> • <i>ANSI 1000-1039- ADA</i> • <i>ASTM 1239-1784</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>DICOM</i> • <i>HL7 Messaging standards</i> • <i>X12 Business standards</i> • <i>NCPDP</i> • <i>ebXML</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ICD</i> • <i>CPT</i> • <i>LOINC</i> • <i>SNOMED</i> • <i>RxNorm</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>TLS</i> • <i>HTTP</i> • <i>S</i> • <i>WSS</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>FEIN</i> • <i>HIPAA</i> • <i>National Provider Identifier</i> • <i>Payor Identifier</i> • <i>ISO draft standards</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clinical Guidelines</i> • <i>Business Process</i> 	
Event Code	Event Description							
	<<Action or Transaction>>							
	<<Action or Transaction>>							

<< This section should list the standards that are required for each Use Case event, categorized using the taxonomy of standards created by the Inventory of Inventories Committee and approved by the **HITSP at the March 13th** meeting.>>.

4. Assumptions Made in Creating the Pool of Standards

<< This section should itemize the significant assumptions that were made while developing the pool of standards. Each assumption should be presented in only enough detail to allow the non-technical reader to understand the significance of the assumption on the identification of that standard. For example, did you assume there was a centralized persistent repository of bio-surveillance data, or was the assumption that the data was pulled as needed from a federation of data sources? While the terminology standards may not change based on this assumption, the Information Exchange standards may have. If you assumed that either was the case, note this for the reader as well..>>

Event Code	Event Description	Major Assumptions
	<<Action / Transaction>>	
	<<Action/Transaction>> >	

5. Use Case Open Issues

<< This section should itemize the open issues that were identified while developing the pool of standards. Each issue should be presented in only enough detail to allow the non-technical reader to understand the significance of the issue as it relates to the identification of that standard.>>

Event Code	Event Description	Major Assumptions
	<<Action / Transaction>>	
	<<Action/Transaction>> >	

6. Duplications and Overlaps in Standards

This section describes all the instances where there are duplications or overlaps, among standards for the Use case. Duplication refers to instances where one or more standard can equally meet the requirement. Overlaps refer to instances where some of the requirements are met by multiple standards. In both instances, the duplication or overlap is only relative to the specific Use Case event.

<< Each subsection should list an instance where there are duplications, overlaps, or competition among standards for a specific event. The purpose of this section is to provide enough information to support resolving the duplications and overlaps through dialogue and commitment of the SDOs.>>

Event Code	Event Description	Standard Duplication/ Overlap
)	

	<<Action/Transaction>> >	
	<<Actioin/Transaction>> >	

7. Gaps in Standards

In this subsection we provide a description of the gaps, including missing or incomplete standards, in standards that are required for the events in this Use Case.

Event Code	Event Description	Standard Gap
	<<Action/Transaction>>	
	<<Action/Transaction>> >	

8. Standards to be profiled in Implementation Guides

In this subsection we provide a list of projected profiles for any standards that may note be used “as is”. For example, HTTP is a technology standard that will be used without any changes, DICOM will require profiles/implementation guides specific to a the use case or interaction.

Event Code	Event Description	Standard Gap
	<<Action/Transaction>>	
	<<Action/Transaction>> >	

9. Resolution Recommendations

<< In this section you will tie together the overlaps and gaps and present alternatives for resolving them. We assume that the gaps and overlaps can be related. Until we see more data on the gaps and overlaps, we cannot fully define how this section will be structured..>>

Event Code	Event Description	Standard Duplication/ Overlap/Gap Resolution
)	
	<<Action/Transaction>> >	
	<<Action/Transaction>> >	

10. Next Steps

Each Technical Committee will refine the information contained in this document based on the review and comment of the HITSP (the Panel). The document will be updated to reflect the input and direction of the Panel.

Technical Committees will reconvene to analyze the standards, refine the commitments of industry to resolve gaps and overlaps, and publish a final listing of standards selected for adoption when implementing the events in this specific Use Case. The selection will be based on Level 2 Readiness Characteristics and the results of negotiations and formal commitments within the standards community.

Upon Panel approval of the selected standards, Technical Committees will initiate activities toward creating and testing specific Standards Implementation Instructions¹.

11. Technical Committee Members

<< This section will contain a table that lists the volunteer membership by name and indicate the member organizations. Please list all names in alpha order by last name. Indicate co-chairs with an asterisk.>>

See attached spreadsheet.

Technical Committee Member Name	HITSP Member Organization
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>

¹ A template for this artifact of the HITSP Process is under development.

<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>
<<name of member>>	<<HITSP member organization that this person represented>>

**Members marked with an asterisk served as co-chairs on the committee*

Appendix A - <<Title of Use Case>>

<<Project management will provide this section>>

Appendix B – HITSP Taxonomy of Health Standards

<<Project management will provide this section>>

Appendix C – Standards Readiness Level 1 Analysis

<< This section will contain the results of using the Level 1 characteristics on the pool of standards identified. It will discuss the risks associated with each standard that may be de-selected. For any standard that was considered and disqualified from consideration, please discuss the rationale. Possible reasons may include (but are not limited to):

- no existing commercial implementations*
- existing standard is in the process of being deprecated*
- other standard(s) are deemed more relevant (enumerate why)*

The exact format and content instructions for this section will be provide by Project Management after the Level 1 Readiness criteria are approved by HITSP.>>