

Practice Incentives Program eHealth Incentive Requirement 1 – Secure Messaging Capability

Technical Workshop #5 – Meeting Summary Sydney, 23 July 2009

1. Overview

The 5th Technical Workshop on Secure Messaging was held at the Stamford Plaza at Sydney Airport from 9.30am to 4.30pm on Thursday, 23 July 2009. NEHTA jointly hosted the workshop with MSIA. Representatives from 14 organisations from the medical software industry attended.

Presentations are available on the NEHTA Website at <http://www.nehta.gov.au/pip> under the *Documents & Presentations* link.

2. Welcome and General Update

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

Tina and Vince jointly chaired the workshop and welcomed participants.

2.1. Workshops

Discussion was held about the Sub-Committee Tech Working Group on Wednesday 26th August and the General Workshop on Thursday 27th August being transferred to Canberra. However after the workshop it was realised that HIC'09 is in the previous week, so the workshops on 26th and 27th will remain in Sydney at Stamford.

2.2. Interconnectivity Scope (DoHA)

Vince had put questions around the scope concerning Interconnectivity / Interoperability to DoHA. The response from DoHA is that they would prefer that the working group suggest recommendations but they offered to participate in workshops on this topic where required.

2.3. PIP Certification (DoHA)

Vince put questions around Certification to DoHA. Response from DoHA is that they would prefer that the working group suggest recommendations but they offered to participate in workshops on this topic where required.

2.4. IHE Update

Vince outlined that IHE Australia are running connect-a-thons from 28-31 July.

Vince outlined that DoHA have provided funding to IHE for a connect-a-thon relating to the Secure Messaging specifications for early 2010. The funding is related to testing interconnectivity between vendors. Vince mentioned that Pathology may be used as a candidate and may possibly be HL7 2.4, but this would need an update to the current HL7 2.3.1 IHE profile.

The IHE funding will be managed by the MSIA with HL7 Australia acting as fund holder. The actual amount of funding will depend on the number of vendors participating in the connect-a-thon.

IHE Australia has also been tasked with defining an e-Referral profile.

NEHTA outlined that the IHE connect-a-thon work complements the NEHTA work program however conformance will be a separate process.

2.5. Conformance, Compliance and Accreditation

The members were also referred to a recent letter to the MSIA from Peter Fleming (NEHTA CEO) outlining plans for Conformance, Compliance and Accreditation.

This topic will be discussed in more detail at the next workshop on 6th August.

2.6. Collaboration Portal

It was recognised that the portal's Terms of Use had caused concern. During the meeting, Paul Burnham and Bridget Kirkham quickly reviewed a revised draft version of the Terms of Use. This version was a vast improvement and some minor changes were recommended. This draft version will now undergo final review at NEHTA and be presented back to the MSIA for comment.

3. Update from Technical Sub-Committee

Andrew Berry (NEHTA) and Jared Davison (Medical-Objects)

The Technical Sub-Committee met for the first time from the 21-22 July at the Stamford in Sydney. The workshops were successful. The Working Group thanked those on the Technical Sub-Committee for their efforts.

Andrew presented the outcomes and recommendations from the Technical Sub-Committee. Jared also clarified a number of points during the discussion.

Consensus was that this group needed time to digest the outcomes and recommendations of the Technical Sub-Committee before the recommendations are approved.

Below are the main topics covered by the Technical Sub-Committee:

3.1.Immediate and Deferred Semantics

All of the use cases were defined and inappropriate ones eliminated.

Bridging was discussed at the last workshop. It was decided that you cannot downgrade to an immediate mode operation into a deferred mode operation.

It was agreed to ensure that there is always a path to communicate with the other party.

Recommendation is that implementations MUST support deferred mode and SHOULD support immediate mode. That is, deferred mode is required and immediate mode recommended. It was noted that Medical Objects' position is that the sender should support both (mandatory) and that the receiver can choose either.

The sender can determine if the receiver supports immediate mode by looking up the receiver's Endpoint Location Service (ELS).

It was clarified that the proposal for transformations between specific services and the PIP delivery service was to only apply to clinical services. It was not intended to apply to non-clinical services (such as ELS and UHI services).

Action: Andrew Berry to incorporate these recommendations into the specifications.

Action: The Working Group members will consider the implications of this position for formal agreement at a later meeting.

3.2.XSP vs S/MIME for Payload Encryption

Recommendation is that implementations MUST support S/MIME and SHOULD support XML Secured Payload (XSP) for payload security. That is, S/MIME is mandatory and XML Secured Payload (XSP) is recommended for payload security.

There are key dependencies between this work and the other NEHTA work.

The exact S/MIME format will still have to be defined. Ideally it will reflect what vendors are currently doing, but that might not be possible.

A question was raised about whether S/MIME will be deprecated at some point in the future. There are currently no plans to do this.

3.3.Transport responses for deferred mode

Recommendation is to permit multiple responses, but they are optional for both sender and receiver. Multiple transport responses will only occur if both the sender wants them and the receiver can provide them.

The final transport response is still mandatory.

Those transport responses can be bundled together, i.e. batched.

Intermediaries can request "upgrade", but it is still optional for receiver.

3.4.Transport Authentication

The subcommittee did not come up with an agreed position on this topic. All of the options (TLS, S/MIME, WS-Security) are still available for consideration. WS-Security has re-emerged as a possible mechanism.

Jared stated that non-repudiation of messages (not just authentication and confidentiality) is a requirement. To be discussed further in the afternoon.

3.5.Network identification for transport authentication

A new requirement was identified: the current business models require identification of the networks (i.e. the messaging vendors) for billing purposes. The Medicare Certificates do not identify the networks.

The proposed solution is to use network specific certificates for transport authentication.

3.6.Endpoint Location Service

Concerns were raised about the "single ELS per provider" model. Some vendors want to run an ELS for their network.

4. General Discussion / Suggested Topics

4.1. Microsoft Attendance

It was noted that Microsoft couldn't attend the Sub-Tech Workshop or this Workshop due to other commitments. Microsoft are however very committed to the process and will still follow and contribute to the forums and are aiming to get back to face to face discussions.

4.2. Unique Health Identifiers

The participants outlined their interest in the UHI program as this is likely to be one of the early pieces of infrastructure to be implemented within their products. It was agreed that a senior representative from the UHI team would be invited to a workshop on the 27th August.

Action: MSIA undertook to collate some suggested questions so that the UHI team could tailor their discussion.

5. Specifications for other Interfaces

John McMillan (NEHTA)

5.1. Specifications

The Secure Messaging group within NEHTA are working on a number of specifications which will be submitted to Standards Australia for industry input:

- Clinical Document Delivery (CDD)
- Web Services Profile (WSP)
- XML Secured Profile (XSP)
- Endpoint Location Service (ELS)

CDD has been the main focus of the Working group.

WSP will be discussed at the next Tech Sub-Committee. This is a 'foundation' specification underpinning the Secure Messaging work program and was for review rather than change.

XSP has been developed to support the needs of other services (such as the UHI services), so have been driven by requirements and stakeholders greater than just PIP.

ELS provides a capability to find a service .It does not preclude the ability to use other interfaces to access that information, nor preclude other implementations of it by different vendors. It was agreed that a NEHTA Architect (Mark Briggs) should present to the Technical Sub-Committee on the ELS.

Action: ELS to be presented by Mark Briggs at the next Technical Sub-Committee.

Action: WSP to be discussed at the next Technical Sub-Committee.

Action: XSP will need to be reviewed at the next Technical Sub-Committee. Although it is a recommended (i.e. non-mandatory) part of the CDD specification, and the group should review it.

Action: S/MIME will need to be profiled at the next subcommittee.

6. Interfaces, roles and use cases

Hoylen Sue (NEHTA)

The interfaces, roles and use cases identified by the Tech Sub-Committee were presented.

These lead to a set of roles which vendors will classify their products against. The products are then certificated against the criteria for those roles. A single product might claim to satisfy multiple roles, in which case it needs to satisfy the union of the criteria for all of those roles.

The Working Group agreed to this approach.

7. Conformance and Testing

General Discussion

A general discussion took place on Conformance and Testing for PIP. It was noted that participants wanted to initially discuss this topic without the NEHTA CCA team present.

7.1. Discussion points

- Application and assessment of a GP Practice was discussed. DoHA have subsequently clarified this item and refer to the PIP eHealth Incentive Guidelines. The Guidelines were included in the Vendor packs released by DoHA to MSIA in Mid March. In summary, once a Practice applies they will continue to be paid quarterly for the incentive as long as they continue to be eligible. For a Practice to receive a payment in the August quarter, practices need to have met the requirements for all of May, June and July, and be assessed as eligible at the 'point in time' of 31 July. There is no periodic application (eg yearly), however Practices need to notify Medicare of any changes that may affect their eligibility. Medicare Australia have an ongoing audit process to check eligibility.
- Letters that Vendors signed state: Eligible Suppliers need to comply with the specifications and implementation timelines mutually and progressively agreed with industry.
- It was expressed that those Vendors who are currently on the Eligible Supplier list that do not implement the specifications in the mutually agreed timelines should be subject to removal from the Eligible Supplier list. Those that choose to implement need to have the appropriate recognition.
- NEHTA will supply sample code for assessment by the Technical Sub-Committee (prior to general release).
- NEHTA plans to supply training, educational, workshops that encourage and accelerate take up by industry. This is planned to occur once the specifications are finalised. These should lower the effort and cost for Vendors.
- IHE connect-a-thon and process could be leveraged to trial the development. This complements the objectives but would not be considered to be conformance. It was noted that connect-a-thons are only occasionally run.
- Point was raised that a Certification Authority was required. Costs associated with certification continued to be raised.
- Cost of development, deployment, support and conformance concern the MSIA membership. NEHTA will be working for a balanced and achievable outcome for vendors.

- Vendors seeking low cost, minimalist but worthwhile approach. It was stated by members that if a high (and costly) conformance approach is required then funding should be provided.
- Compliance will apply to roles that a Vendor chooses to take.
- Gateway focus for compliance initially, and then at the desktop.
- Self Certification was discussed but not supported. A more robust model was recommended.

7.2. Conformance and Testing discussion at next workshop

The actual approach for Conformance will be discussed at the next workshop with the NEHTA CCA team present.

8. Authentication

General Discussion

8.1. Transport Authentication

Discussions took place around the following topics:

- What are the use cases for billing? The first step is to identify the other party.
- If there are vendor issued certificates, there needs to be a way to know if they are to be trusted.
- A client needs to know which transport certificate to trust (and know who to charge). That means the network vendor will have a CA certificate that they use to issue certificates to their clients. The vendor could possibly operate as a registration authority for an existing CA, or establish a new CA.
- This item will be referred to the Technical Sub-Committee.

8.2. Non-Repudiation

Discussions took place around the following topics:

- Non-Repudiation was a nice to have for some members and not a requirement for others. So it is considered a 'MAY' option.
- Having transport digital signatures that are persisted (for non-repudiation of the network sending it) means the transport security must be message level. This is leading the solution towards WS-Security as the transport security mechanism. Using S/MIME as the transport security mechanism is not a standard way of implementing SOAP Web services and will not be supported by toolkits out of the box. It is possible place the S/MIME in the SOAP, but that means you have payload XSP or S/MIME embedded inside another S/MIME message which is then embedded inside SOAP which is then sent over a transport (which is probably going to be unsecured HTTP, since the transport security is dealt with by the outer S/MIME layer) – complex, but possible.
- Message signatures without a 3rd Party timestamp might not be enough for non-repudiation.
- This item will be referred to the Technical Sub-Committee.

9. Future meetings

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

It was agreed to have the following:

- Technical Subcommittee: 4 and 5 August 2009 at Sydney Stamford
- Workshop: 6 August 2009 at Sydney Stamford. Will include update from Tech Sub-Committee and CCA.
- Technical Subcommittee: 26 August 2009 at Sydney Stamford
- Workshop: 27 August 2009 at Sydney Stamford. Will include an update from UHI team.
- Technical Subcommittee: 15 September 2009 (date reserved; only if needed)
- Workshop: 16 September 2009

Action: Jared Davison to coordinate with Andrew Berry on the Tech Sub-Committee agenda.

The aim is to wrap up all technical issues for the specification by 5 August 2009.

10. Closure

Meeting closed at 4:30pm

Appendix A: Attendance list

Total Attendance : 22

Organisation	Individual	Role
ACSS	Ben Miller	Documentations Support
Argus Connect International	Phillip Cameron	
eClinic	Gavan Lim-Joon	Chief Technical Officer
Global Health	Tim Clarke	Product Manager, Integration
HealthLink	Lars Becker	Manager Strategic Projects Product Manager Messaging
HCN	Staffan Flodin	Software Development Director
iSoft	Paul Doman	Operations Manager, Primary Care
Key Trust Group	Chris Lynton-Moll	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	Hoylen Sue	Technical Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	John McMillan	Manager, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	Paul Burnham	Manager, Reference Platform
NEHTA	Tina Connell-Clark	Manager, Standards
Pen Computing	Tarkan Shahho	Pen Computing
Rouesnel Software	Laurence Rouesnel	Director
Smart Health Solutions	Larry Singer	
Smart Services CRC	Brett Avery	
Stat Health	Cameron Jaffrey	Director - Development

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 Burnham	Distributed to PIPWG	24/7/09 Complete
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	25/6/09 Closed
5.	Follow up with those suppliers who have signed Statement of Commitment but who are not participating in workshops is required.	Bridget, Paul Burnham	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 NEHTA website, advised to attendees	Paul Burnham	Loaded onto website	17/4/09 Complete

nehta

No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
7.	Endpoint Location Service (ELS) specs to be put up on website and circulated to workshop attendees	John McMillan	Distributed 28 th July to members.	28/7/09 Closed
8.	Consideration for Travel Expenses to be reimbursed for up to 15 members (rather than current 10).	Tina/Paul Burnham	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 Manfield	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 McMillan	Logins have been distributed.	July 09 Closed
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 Burnham	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 brown-field 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 summary.	Closed
13.	Clarification of PIP secure messaging scope and requirements in comparison with NEHTA solution	John McMillan	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	4/6/2009 Closed

nehta

No	Item	Owner	Comments	Date Action
	specifications		other eHealth domains and the PIP secure messaging solution was also presented at the 4 June workshop.	
14.	Clarification over documents, messages, acknowledgements and use cases required, ie the language used for describing these	John McMillan	Discussed at 6 May workshop, will be clarified into scope document.	4/6/2009 Closed
15.	Standards Australia to be involved in ongoing process	Tina	Tina appointed as Standards Manager at NEHTA.	Closed
16.	Privacy Requirements	John McMillan	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
17.	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	
18.	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	Closed
19.	Portal conditions of use	John McMillan	Determine a suitable conditions of use for the collaboration portal. Paul and Bridget have reviewed a draft of terms and submitted to NEHTA engagement team. Looks acceptable.	
20.	Continue TLS vs message security on the mailing list	Andrew Berry	Post a question about TLS vs message security on the mailing list to continue the discussion. Completed.	Closed
21.	Technical subcommittee agenda	Andrew Berry	Develop and email an agenda for the first Technical Subcommittee meeting. Completed.	Closed
22.	Milestones for the Working Group	Membership	Develop a list of milestones for the Working Group.	