



**CDS (Clinical Decision Support) Connect Work Group
Meeting Summary
February 20, 2020
3:00-4:00 pm ET**

Attendees: 39 people including 11 phone dial-ins (50 total)

Organization	Attendee Names
AHRQ Members	Ed Lomotan, Roland Gamache, Shafa Al-Showk
Work Group (WG) Members	Maria Michaels, Ryan Mullins, Mustafa Ozkaynak, Randolph Barrows, Marc Sainvil, Joe Bormel, Daryl Chertcoff, Majid Afshar, Kevin Larsen, Syed Sameemuddin, , Andrey Soares, Barry Blumenfeld, Bill Lober, Kim Bryan, Diane Montella, Frank Sonnenberg, Dwayne Hoelscher, Jeremy Michel, Julie Gervais, Linda Wedemeyer, Lisa Lang, Maggie Dorr, Laura Marcial, Noam Artz, Preston Lee, Raajiv Ravi
MITRE CDS Connect Members	Eileen Chang, Matt Coarr, Lacy Fabian, Susan Haas, Lisa Ide, Chris Moesel, Noranda Brown, David Winters, Tom Read, Michelle Lenox, Dylan Mahalingam

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Review the CDS Connect CPG-on-FHIR Design Changes
- Share new features and resources available for CDS Connect
- Discuss topics of interest to members relating to opportunities for CDS Connect/HIMMS
- Closing

ACTION ITEMS

- Work Group (WG) members may email the MITRE CDS Connect team with ideas on presenters or presentation topics for upcoming Work Group meetings.
- Work Group (WG) members may email the MITRE CDS Connect team with feedback on design changes presented during working group session.

MEETING SUMMARY

Review the CDS Connect CPG-on-FHIR Design Changes

The MITRE team presented a proposed design for the Artifacts Repository pages with CPG-on-FHIR integration. The goal of the design demonstration was to gather feedback and generate discussion on the alignment with CPG-on-FHIR. The goal of the proposed design was not only to demonstrate a tighter alignment with CPG-on-



FHIR, but address the feedback previously received from MedStar, the CDS Connect working group and 3rd party contributors.

Feedback from Work Group (WG) Members and Discussion

1. A WG member loved the ideas of knowledge levels being shown simultaneously, having run up against similar challenge themselves.
2. A WG member saw the CPG on FHIR metadata section helpful for those related artifacts but identified that it leaves out other basic smart sets or related projects when addressing required and non-required fields.
3. A WG member went on to raise the question of ownership and file creation, leading to a discussion on location of this information and the greater topic of authorship.
 - Location of authorship information should be at lower end of layout.
 - Discussion on authorship was framed with comment CDS Connect had not required contact information, based on premise it could act as a barrier to entry.
 - WG member made comparison to journal article authorship information, where a contact person is specified, beyond organization steward, citing the challenge of getting in touch with person(s) who built the artifact. Another WG member shared that for their work, the assumption was that contact information was vital, and so is a key piece that they modeled all their FHIR resources on, even down the shareable elements.
 - A WG member pointed out that tabbed format of design suggested a 1:1 relationship between artifact and knowledge level, when in fact their experience was that it may be a more to many relationship (1 L1 narrative gives rise to multiple L2s).
 - A WG member asked if this design envisions a contributor for each of the tabs, or if there would be flexibility, to support a L1 narrative entry in relation to an L3 tab entry. Response was that design did have a common set of information per tab, but that would want to stay flexible and take on variations.
 - A WG members raised concern that L1 submission alone seemed insufficient for entry into repository, and with it, the required authorship.
 - A second WG member referenced their recent open source CoVID19 work, and a reluctance to be a required contact for the L1 artifact, even as they want to collaborate. Raised possibility of an open source option.
 - Discussion concluded with example of how linking and permissions might occur to support open source.
4. A WG member noted new design should be easy for end users to navigate
5. As a comment on Artifact Tags, a WG member mentioned versioning and how that might be tracked.
 - a. The MITRE team shared that versioning is not a required field in current CDS Connect, and it is not enforced, though it is available to those who login.
 - b. A WG member shared that for L3 content, it is required, but it only takes effect when artifact has moved from Drafts into Active Status.
6. The concept of hierarchical knowledge levels and the value of packaging related artifacts together for ease of use (e.g., download) was discussed as a need. The MITRE team shared an example of a current artifact, labeled as a composite artifact, that demonstrates this linking together; it acts as a shell for a list of related artifacts.



What's New with CDS Connect

The MITRE team shared information about updates and new features for the prototype tools, repository, authoring tool and artifacts.

Questions from Work Group (WG) Members

There were no questions from WG Members.

Announcements / Other Questions

1. Working group meeting will now run from 3:00-4:00 pm to accommodate members conflicting obligations.
2. The dates and times of several CDS Connect presentations being given at HIMMS were shared. Working group members attending HIMMS were invited to attend.
3. A WG member asked about status of updates to changes on pain management summary. The MITRE team responded that the changes were live on GitHub, which is accessible through the community link on the artifact's page in the repository. Values sets and codes are being worked on, expect to post next week.
4. A WG member asked if calendar invites for CDS Connect HIMMS presentations were available. There is not, but those dates and times are included within the slide deck associated with this work group meeting.

Closing