

# Publication Request for C-CDA Rubric Criteria, Informative Guide, Release 1

Publication Request	Publication Request
1. Published Name of the Standard for which request is being made	HL7 Informative Document: C-CDA Scorecard Rubric, Release 1- US Realm
2. Standards Material/Document	Informative
3. Date of Request	Apr 30, 2020
4. Use Period	
5. Reason for extension, timeline, and actions	
6. Original Publication Date	
7. End date of the current STU period	
8. Length of the requested extension	
9. Review Process	
10. HL7 Work Group making this request and date	Structured Documents
10a. Requesting WG Date	Apr 30, 2020
11. URL of approval minutes	<a href="https://confluence.hl7.org/display/SD/2020-04-23+Agenda+and+Minutes">https://confluence.hl7.org/display/SD/2020-04-23+Agenda+and+Minutes</a>
12. HL7 Product Management Group	CDA Management Group
12a. Management Group Date of Approval	May 06, 2020
13. URL of approval minutes	<a href="https://confluence.hl7.org/display/CDA/2020-05-06+Meeting+notes">https://confluence.hl7.org/display/CDA/2020-05-06+Meeting+notes</a>
14. Is the artifact ready for final publication?	Yes
15. If not ready, please describe remaining steps.	
16. Tool name used to produce the machine processable artifacts in the IG	NA
17. The name of the "IG artifact" within the context of the above mentioned tool.	NA
18. Balloted Name of the standard for which request is being made	HL7 Informative Document: C-CDA Scorecard Rubric, Release 1- US Realm
19. Requested name for published standard	HL7 Informative Document: C-CDA Scorecard Rubric, Release 1- US Realm

<b>20. If CMET, list IDs balloted</b>	
<b>21. Project Insight Number</b>	1498
<b>22. Document Realm</b>	US
<b>23. Ballot cycle in which the document was successfully balloted</b>	May 2019
<b>24. Results of that ballot (following reconciliation activities):</b>	24. Results of that ballot (following reconciliation activities): (not needed for errata, STU extension, or unballoted STU update)
<b>25. Affirmative</b>	55
<b>26. Negative</b>	7
<b>27. Abstentions</b>	34
<b>28. Not Returned</b>	12
<b>29. Total in ballot pool</b>	108
<b>30. Date on which final document/standards material was supplied to HQ</b>	
<b>31. URL of publication material/ SVN repository</b>	<a href="http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/structure/CDA_IG_C-CDA_RUBRIC_CRIT_R1_O1_2020_MAY.docx">http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/structure/CDA_IG_C-CDA_RUBRIC_CRIT_R1_O1_2020_MAY.docx</a>
<b>32. Publishing Facilitator</b>	Matt Rahn
<b>33. Special Publication Instructions</b>	
<b>34. URL of ballot reconciliation document</b>	<a href="http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/ballots/2019MAY/reconciliation/recon_hl7_c-cda_rubric_r1_i1_2019may.xls">http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/ballots/2019MAY/reconciliation/recon_hl7_c-cda_rubric_r1_i1_2019may.xls</a>
<b>35. Has the Work Group posted its consideration of all comments received in its reconciliation document on the ballot desktop?</b>	Yes
<b>36. Substantive Changes Since Last Ballot?</b>	
<b>37. Product Brief Reviewed By</b>	Structured Documents Workgroup
<b>38. Date Product Brief Reviewed</b>	Apr 30, 2020
<b>39. Has the Product Brief changed?</b>	
<b>Product Brief</b>	<b>Product Brief</b>
<b>40. Family</b>	CDA
<b>41. Section</b>	Implementation Guides, Rules and References
<b>42. Topic</b>	Terminology

43. Please Describe the Topic	C-CDA Data Quality
44. Product Type	Data Types Document Methodology Specifications Services Standard Reference Materials Structures
45. Parent standard	CDA
46. Parent Standard Status	Active
47. Update/replace standard	
48. Common name/search keyword	Rubric, Rubric Criteria, C-CDA Scoring Rubric, Scoring
49. Description	This informative implementation guide contains rubric criteria created through an ongoing project in the HL7 Structured Documents Work Group (SDWG), originating in 2016. Throughout 2018 a group of HL7 members created a new set of rubrics to add to the original rubric. This project identified key problem areas in real system-generated C-CDA documents where similar data was consistently misrepresented or incomplete. Variably constructed data removes the ability to share and compare data reliably, adversely impacting interoperability. The rubric criteria indicate where the implementation community, using the C-CDA standard, has agreed the constraints need to be improved in order to support a greater degree of interoperability. The guide describes the rubrics in prose that facilitate the encoding of testable rules in tooling.
Targets	Targets  These are categories of potential users, implementers, or other interested parties such as those that are indicated on the Project Scope Statement under "Stakeholders/Vendors/Providers". Select those that are applicable, or suggest others:
50. Stakeholders	Regulatory Agency, Payors
51. Vendors	EHR, PHR, Health Care IT, HIS
52. Providers	
53. Benefits	The goal is to promote the expansion of nationwide interoperability by allowing providers and health IT developers to identify inconsistencies in data representation in C-CDA documents and proactively adopt tighter constraints to eliminate the variability using these rubric. C-CDA quality assessment tooling built based on these criteria will support the expansion of useful nationwide interoperability.
54. Implementations/Case Studies	ONC Scorecard
55. Development Background	ONC Scorecard