

**Practice Incentives Program eHealth Incentive
Secure Messaging Requirement**

**Technical Workshop #8 – Meeting Summary
Sydney, 16 September 2009**

1. Overview

The 8th Technical Workshop on Secure Messaging was held at the Stamford Plaza at Sydney Airport from 9.30am to 4.30pm on Wednesday, 16 September 2009. NEHTA jointly hosted the workshop with MSIA and it was attended by members from the medical software industry.

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

2. General update

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

2.1. Publication of Specifications

The Secure Messaging specifications are on target to be submitted to Standards Australia by the end of Sept 2009:

The documents will be emailed to the PIP working group mailing list by Friday, 25 September 2009. NEHTA will also place the specifications on the NEHTA website for wider industry feedback.

Eligible Suppliers (see www.nehta.gov.au/pip-vendors) will also be provided with an update on the progress of the Secure Messaging specifications.

The current specification is very technical in nature. Additional introductory material will need to be provided so that the technical material is more understandable by a wider audience.

Public feedback on the Secure Messaging specifications should be channelled to securemessaging@nehta.gov.au

2.2. Medicare Australia and Certificates

Vince McCauley (MSIA) has had discussions with Medicare Australia about the need for suitable certificates to support secure messaging for implementations. Medicare is aware of the limitations in usage of the current certificates in the proposed secure messaging specifications. Particular issues relate to .NET toolkits and signing/encrypting.

Vince was looking for about 200 certificates initially, plus a subsequent rollout of 5000 certificates to vendors as a seeding. Vince will continue discussions with Medicare.

Discussions on implementation also covered the use of National Authentication Service for eHealth (NASH) and also existing vendor PKI solutions.

2.3.XSP Implementation Experience (SmartHealth)

Larry Singer reported that he has spent one day implementing XML Secured Payload. In that day, he got about 80% of it working: he got signing and encrypting working, but has yet to finish decrypting. This was done in Java using the documentation provided by NEHTA.

Larry mentioned that it was relatively easy to implement XSP and that he mainly had to pick up new skills with Digital Certificates and External libraries.

Implementers will need to be aware that Mac OS X Snow Leopard currently only supports Java 6. This has been a problem with the Medicare Client adapter. This will need to be managed, such as using alternative libraries (e.g. Bouncy Castle). Vince mentioned that Medicare have been requested to support later versions of Java.

2.4.Tech Sub-Committee Funding

Vince outlined that members of the Tech Sub-Committee should submit claims for payment to MSIA asap.

2.5.Meeting 29 Sept 2009

A workshop meeting on 29 Sept 2009 was agreed. Members from both PIP Working Group and Tech Sub-Committee are encouraged to attend.

3. Technical Sub-Committee Update

Andrew Berry (NEHTA)

Andrew provided an update on progress made by the Technical Sub-Committee. Refer to Andrew's presentation for more detail.

3.1.Work Completed

All the technical issues have been resolved and a complete end-to-end review of the technical specification has been completed. The document review has resulted in some minor editing work, which will be done by 22 September 2009.

3.2.Transport Security

The subcommittee recommends that TLS will be mandatory (MUST) and WS-Security is optional (MAY). The feedback from network administrators was that TLS is currently widely deployed and well understood. There are valid reasons for using WS-Security in certain situations, and that is why it is still an option.

There are issues with deploying both TLS and WS-Security using current Medicare Certificates. The Medicare Certificates can be used on the client side for TLS, but they cannot be used on the server side for TLS. It is expected that most initial implementations will be gateway based, so this has very limited impact. It should be noted that TLS has been chosen for technical reasons, and not because of the types of certificates that are available.

3.3.Metadata extension

The subcommittee recommends that an extension mechanism be added to the metadata field. If used, it will be strongly-typed. Any use must ensure privacy obligations are respected. It is noted that Medical-Objects raised an objection to this, because it could provide a mechanism for other groups to use it as an excuse to create additional specific interfaces.

A governance process will need to be established for defining extensions. This is not an objection to having this extensible metadata, but the process of how they will be defined needs to be addressed.

3.4. Transport Errors & Response Codes

The subcommittee recommends that transport errors are represented as *error classes* and *error codes*. The specification will define standard transport *error classes*. The specification will not define standard *error codes*.

A governance process for the development of *error codes* will be needed.

3.5. Billing

Support for the Billing process will be included in specification, how billing occurs and the content is not in the scope of work.

The subcommittee has produced a set of billing related conformance points. It supports billing as a per-invocation feature (though more advanced billing models are not prohibited by it). It also allows for distinct billing parties and billable parties, which may or may not be the same as the sender and receiver.

The working group noted that these are more about policy rather than conformance.

The working group decided that this material will be put into a separate handbook—it will not be a part of the draft specification.

4. Healthcare Identifier Update

Bill Bolton (Health Identifiers, NEHTA), Steve Burmester (NEHTA)

Bill provided an update on the Health Identifier program. Refer to presentation for detailed information.

4.1. Specifications

The working group indicated that they would like to see the Interface specifications and other details of the available services.

4.2. Testing

Medicare Sandbox will be available October 2009 and the Development Test Environment will be available November 2009. The working group requested information on what the arrangements are to connect to the environments.

4.3. Workshop with Industry

Suggestion that there is a workshop with broader industry.

5. National Authentication Service for eHealth (NASH) Update

Steve Burmester (NEHTA)

Steve provided an update on the NASH program. Refer to presentation for detailed information.

5.1. Secure Messaging Certificates

Certificates are required to support TLS and XSP for the Secure Messaging specifications.

5.2. Workshop with Industry

Suggestion that there is a workshop with broader industry.

6. Conformance Compliance Accreditation

Dwight Gunning, John Gottschalk (NEHTA), Jane Gilbert (AHML)

Members of the NEHTA CCA team and AHML met separately to the Working Group during the day. They examined the conformance test specifications, assessment scheme and PIP requirements.

Dwight, John and Jane presented to the Working Group on their progress.

6.1. Test Scenarios / Test Cases

The draft test scenarios document was presented.

It was recommended that the test scenarios will not be included in the draft standard, because that is already well covered in the revised draft standard. Adding test scenarios will make the document longer without adding significant value. The Working Group agreed with this: it will not be in the draft standard, but will be made available in an accompanying document.

6.2. Must, Should and May - adherence to Specifications

Discussion took place on aspects of the specifications that are indicated as a MUST, SHOULD or MAY. The SMD specification seeks to comply with RFC2119 which gives a clear explanation of these declarative terms.

SHOULD is for those elements that are strongly recommended to be done but they may not be testable or there may be circumstances where the condition cannot be tested.

Gavan raised that if you meet the MUST that should be all that is required for PIP Compliance, keep it to a minimum.

Dwight explained the use of conformance 'profiles' to recognise support for one or more endpoint roles and 'levels' to recognise support for extended behaviours above the minimum.

It was indicated that Vendors are recommended to step up and do the other SHOULD and MAY elements of specifications.

6.3. Dispute Resolution

How dispute resolution should occur for issues raised in relation to conformance will need to be explored further.

Discussion amongst the group identified the need for a broader feedback, issues tracking as well as dispute resolution processes. It was agreed this should form an agenda item for the next working group session.

6.4. Independent Testing/Assessment Scheme

The 'assessment scheme' will be a document to describe what and how the assessment will occur. Suggestion of a Conformance Handbook.

David Manfield put forward that the Test Specification being developed by CCA in consultation with the working group should form the basis of the conformance assessment. It was agreed that this will provide a fair and consistent baseline.

Tiered testing approach, some vendors may go into a lot more detail than others depending on their solution offering. Automated Testing tools are also on the table. 3rd Party Testing is preferred.

6.5. Subsequent engagement

The test specifications may require further interaction beyond the end September.

7. Wrap Up

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

7.1. Secure Message Delivery

The working group endorsed the name "Secure Messaging Delivery" for the draft standard.

7.2. Development Assistance/Workshops

The group requested what help would be available to develop and implement the specifications. NEHTA will be able to supply:

- Sample code for .NET and Java;
- Connection to the NEHTA Reference Platform (sandpit) to implement and trial the specifications;
- Potential for hands-on industry workshops if there is sufficient interest.

7.3. Industry Briefing

Request was made for an Industry Briefing on progress on the specifications. Also Eligible Suppliers will need to be advised on progress and agreed timelines and approach.

8. Future meetings

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

It was agreed to have the following:

- Workshop: 29 September 2009, 9.30 to 3.30 (will now be an early finish) at Stamford Sydney

9. Closure

Meeting closed at 4.30 pm

Appendix A: Attendance list

Organisation	Individual	Role
ACCS	Ben Miller	Documentations Support
AHML	Jane Gilbert	
Argus Connect International	Phil 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	
Key Trust Group	Chris Lynton-Moll	Director
LRS Health	Glen Kleidon	
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	David Manfield	Manager, CCA
NEHTA	Dwight Gunning	CCA
NEHTA	Hoylen Sue	Technical Architect, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	John Gottschalk	CCA
NEHTA	John McMillan	Manager, Secure Messaging
NEHTA	Paul Burnham	Manager, Reference Platform
NEHTA	Tina Connell-Clark	Manager, Standards
Pen Computer Systems	Tarkan Shahho	Technical Services Manager
Smart Health Solutions	Larry Singer	
Sonic Healthcare	Bryan Jones	
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.	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. 31/8: New Terms of Use loaded to website. (Complete)	Complete 31/8/09
3.	Milestones for the Working Group	Membership	Develop a list of milestones for the Working Group.	
4.	Canvass conformance requirements	Jane Gilbert	Jane to canvass membership requirements on conformance.	Complete 16/9/09
5.	Draft Test Specs	Dwight Gunning	Dwight to send Jane Gilbert a copy of the draft test specification for Web Services Profile	Complete 16/9/09

Note that previous closed items have been removed, refer to previous minutes.