

A Survey on Shared Electronic Health Record Architectures in Europe

Raimund Vogl^a, Christian Laucher^b, Robert Penz^b, Patricia Schirmer^b, Thomas Schabetsberger^a, Elske Ammenwerth^a

^aUMIT – University for Health Sciences, Medical Informatics and Technology, Eduard Wallnöfer Zentrum 1, A-6060 Hall, Austria

^bHITT health information technology tirol, Leopoldstrasse 1, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria

Abstract

The EU e-Health action plan has initiated activities across Europe for e-Health and the creation of Shared Electronic Health Records (SEHR). Most of the member states are preparing or already have roadmaps and programs. Information on these activities, especially on the more technical aspects, is of great importance for informed decision making but very hard to find – due to the early stages and transitory phases in which those programs are currently in, with communication being considered no priority. To gain first hand insight, a survey was conducted amongst active experts in the field of SEHR, identified by having given topical presentations at selected international conferences in 2006. The survey was conducted online, with 35 participants (19.4 % of all approached) answering the questionnaire on general e-Health strategy, the SEHR program in general and technical aspects of the program. Of the participants, 80% know of an SEHR program in their country they could answer questions on. The majority judges the programs to be in their early stages and is sceptical against official statements for program completion timeframes. Trans-national (EU level) interoperability is only seen by 56% of the participants as an issue. The Internet protocol is exclusively seen as means of transport for the exchange of SEHR data. The majority foresees a mostly decentral federated architecture with central patient index, but federated metadata registries and data repositories for the SEHR. HL7 V3 CDA, DICOM and IHE XDS achieve highest ranking as standards and technical frameworks for realization of the SEHR. SEHR projects currently are in an early stage where specifications are not finalized and still subject to change. Research and pilot projects, that have in some cases been initiated more than a decade ago, are present in some countries giving directions for how pervasive solutions could work and have to be incorporated into future infrastructures.

Keywords

Electronic Health Records, e-Health, IHE, system architecture

Introduction

In its 2004 e-Health action plan [1], aligned with the eEurope action plan [2], the commission of the EU set ambitious goal to establish a European e-Health infrastructure until 2009. Several measures were defined, amongst them the development of national or regional roadmaps for e-Health by each member state by the end of 2005, the definition of a common approach to patient identification and interoperability standards for health data messages and electronic health records by the end of 2006, the deployment of health information networks for e-Health in the period 2004-2008, the provision of

online services such as teleconsultation, e-prescription, e-referral, telemonitoring and telecare by the majority of European health organisations by the end of 2008, and a baseline for a standardised European qualification for e-Health services in clinical and administrative settings by the end of 2009. This has sparked substantial activities among the EU member states, with a large variety of national and regional projects being started (see for instance [3] for the work on e-Health strategy in Austria). One of the key elements for e-Health strategies is to establish a Shared Electronic Health Record (SEHR) for all citizens, meaning that relevant health related data for citizens is electronically shared across different providers in all the sectors of healthcare. Substantial benefits in terms of quality and productivity in a collaborative care setting are enabled by such infrastructure [4] and seen as indispensable in the future health system [5]. Even though the commission has also agreed in the e-Health action plan, that it will publish a study on the state of the art in deployment, examples of best practices, and the associated benefits biannually in the period 2004-2010 for benchmarking already resulting in valuable studies eg. in the e-Health ERA project [6,7,8], it is still very hard to find information on the functional and technical approaches pursued in the member states in the establishment of shared electronic health records. Studies on certain aspects of shared electronic health records with special focus on EU-wide interoperability like the one on patient summaries conducted in the e-Health ERA project [9] have become available, but also here, only 9 official statements (by the national Ministry of Health or the national e-Health competence centre) were received and issues of health record system architecture were not considered.

Methods

Since information on the various approaches to these technical aspects are of great interest for those contributing to SEHR projects themselves, and currently reports are rarely available, a survey with this focus was made amongst those experts working on SEHR projects to collect their opinion on the scope and status of these projects. It is also interesting to see how e-Health strategies and SEHR programs are viewed by national experts, sometimes in disagreement with the statements of national strategies. For the recruitment of participants for that survey, persons were identified who had either authored or co-authored papers related SEHR given at various conferences in 2006 (to ensure that they are currently actively involved in this field) or who are representatives of national competence centres for e-Health. Additionally, the national representatives of EFMI (European Federation of Medical Informatics) were approached. Since the survey was conducted online, 180 persons were invited via email to participate on Nov 2 2006. With a reminder after one week, the survey was answered by 35 participants (19.4%) until it was closed on Nov 20 2006.

Scope of the Survey and Participation

The online survey was composed of 23 questions in three groups: general questions on the e-Health program, questions on the SEHR program, questions on the SEHR architecture and functionality.

The 35 participants were from 18 countries – mostly European, with additional participation from Russia and Israel (5 from AT and NO, 4 from DE, 3 from IT, 2 from CH, DK, EE, SE, and 1 from FI, FR, GR, IL, IS, LT, PL, PT, RO, RU).

The participant judged themselves mostly as competent or very competent to answer the survey (Table 1):

Table 1 – Competence of participants

How competent do you feel to make statements on the national eHealth strategy with regard to shared electronic health records in that country?	participants
very competent (ie. actively involved in the national e-Health effort)	16 (46%)
competent (ie. expert on the subject with good insight into the national e-Health effort)	9 (26%)
slightly competent (ie. involved in certain aspects of the national e-Health effort)	9 (26%)
not competent (ie. not involved with the national e-Health effort)	1 (2%)

Of those 28 participants who stated there is an SEHR program in their country, their involvement with this program was characterized as described in Table 2:

Table 2 – Involvement in SEHR program

How are you involved with this SEHR program?	participants
Decision maker	3 (11 %)
Consultant	10 (36%)
Program team member	4 (14%)
Member of a stakeholder organization of the program	3 (11%)
Other - not directly affiliated with the program	8 (28%)

Since there were several participants from some of the countries, the agreement between those participants from the same country on selected questions could be determined to have a measure for the reliability of the survey results. The agreement was determined as the percentage of participants from one country giving the top ranking answer for one of 7 selected questions¹. Taking the arithmetic mean of these values, an overall agreement of 79% was found. This indicates that there is generally a good consensus accurately reflecting the e-Health situation, but it also shows that there is a certain controversy in the expert opinion caused mainly by the transitory phase in which most of the countries are with respect to their e-Health programs (eg. the Austrian participants disagreed if there is an Austrian e-Health strategy – the strategy was completed by an expert group in December 2005 [3] but has not yet been official adopted by the Ministry of Health). It was noted by several participants that the survey does not allow to describe the transition phase in which some projects currently are and the coexistence of regional and national programs for SEHR within one country.

Key Results

For the central question for this survey, the design of the SEHR architecture, the participants were given the choice between 5 different designs, ranging from a completely centralized approach for the storage of all SEHR data to completely unfederated decentralized SEHR:

¹ Questions: Is there a national e-Health strategy in your country? When was it formulated? Estimate for the completion of SEHR program? Trans-national interoperability considered? Basis for patient identification? Basis for health professional identification? Network infrastructure?

- Completely central architecture (with limited number of national data centres): Central Patient Index; Central Metadata Index and Patient Summary Data Repository; Central Repository for full SEHR data
- Mostly central architecture (all core data stored in limited number of national centres): Central Patient Index; Central Metadata Index and Patient Summary Data Repository; Decentral Repository for full SEHR data
- Mostly decentral federated architecture: Central Patient Index; Decentral Metadata Index and Patient Summary Data Repository; Decentral Repository for full SEHR data
- Completely decentral federated architecture (federation of RHIO's with cross community data access): Decentral Patient Indices; Decentral Metadata Index and Patient Summary Data Repository; Decentral Repository for full SEHR data
- Completely decentral unfederated architecture (unfederated RHIOs): Decentral Patient Indices without cross enterprise federation; Decentral Metadata Index and Patient Summary Data Repository; Decentral Repository for full SEHR data

The results found are given in Table 3:

Table 3 – Architecture Type

Architecture type	participants	countries
Compl. central architecture	1 (4%)	FI
Mostly central architecture	6 (22%)	AT(2),DK,EE,GR,LT
Mostly decentral federated architecture	9 (33%)	AT(3),CH,DE,EE,RO,SE
Completely decentral federated architecture	3 (11%)	DE,IT(2)
Completely decentral unfederated architecture	1 (4%)	IL
Other/not yet decided	5 (19%)	DE,DK,NO,PL,RU
Uncertain	2 (7%)	NO,PT

Only one participant from Finland sees the national SEHR effort directed towards an all central architecture. The mostly central and mostly decentral architectures prevail – for pragmatic reasons (eg. the amount of actual EHR data that would have otherwise to be stored centrally).

The situation with not yet final specifications for SEHR architectures has its impact on the disagreement between the participants (in Austria, the e-Health strategy prepared by the e-Health Initiative favours a mostly decentral architecture, whereas the preliminary results from a government commissioned feasibility study tend towards a mostly central architecture).

The data items considered to be available via the SEHR (currently or in the future) were named to be:




Figure 1 –Data items in SEHR

For the Israeli program, it was mentioned that a unified discharge summary based on HL7 V3 CDA was considered and confidential information on sexual abuse might also be part of the SEHR.

On the question regarding the standards and technical frameworks considered for the content and the communication of the SEHR, the participants gave the priorities listed in Figure 2. The participants see a clear prevalence of HL7 CDA (eg. over CEN 13606) for the SEHR content. IHE XDS is also very popular as a set of protocols for access to SEHR data – but only slightly in advance over CEN EN 13606 EHRCOM, in which’s scope transmission of healthcare information is also contained. Even though CEN EN 13606 will be a harmonized European standard once completed, the HL7 CDA as ANSI and ISO standard has good reception since its adoption by industry is much better. The good acceptance of ICD and ICMP does not come as a surprise. SNOMED CT is very well considered with 42 %. The popularity of DICOM can also be seen. For Denmark, it was pointed out that the national B-EPR standard which is akin to CEN 13606 is being used. For Italy, the compliance of the SEHR with the “Sistema Pubblico di Cooperazione (SPCoop, Public Cooperation System)” as a national standard was noted. This compilation gives an impression of the importance of various standards, technical frameworks and nomenclatures in the eyes of experts in the field. Since in most cases, the SEHR programs are still in their very early stages with room for adaptation driven by the national

experts, possible directions for the adoption of standards can be seen, where there are no binding regulations yet.




Figure 2 –Standards and technical framework

Conclusion

Contrary to the approach in [9], not national governments or e-Health competence centres were approached with questions on the technical aspects of the national SEHR programs but experts working on these projects. This brings in a certain bias from the individual viewpoints of these experts, but also “official” statements by government institutions (Ministry of Health, national competence centres) do not have to reflect the situation indisputably – apart from being very hard to obtain on a technical level. Looking on the agreement between multiple participants from one nation, it can be seen that there is generally good consensus on the main technical issues. Most disagreement comes from early stage of the programs and transitory phase from pilots and basic infrastructure to full SEHRs. The SEHR programs are in an early stage where specifications are not finalized and still subject to change. Research and pilot projects, that have in some cases been initiated more than a decade ago, are present in some countries giving directions for how pervasive solutions could work and have to be incorporated into future infrastructures. Regional and national activities coexist to form

together the SEHR functionality. National approaches are fairly different across Europe and trans-national interoperability is not seen as a core issue. Industry standards and initiatives (HL7 CDA, DICOM, IHE) are most influential amongst the experts and thus have the potential to lead to basically similar and interoperable architectures for SEHR across Europe. The European standardization effort (CEN EN 13606) is not seen as so important. For the SEHR architecture, most participants foresee a mostly decentralized design with central patient index, but distributed metadata registries and data repositories. The Internet protocol is undisputed as basic transport medium – where secluded intranets as platforms for the utilization of the SEHR are predominant over encrypted communication via the public Internet. Chipcards are seen as one of the main means for patient identification for the SEHR, and health professional cards are rated top for identification of healthcare professions. The timeframe for completion of the SEHR programs is seen by most experts in their private opinion more sceptical than in the official statements, foreseeing completion mainly in a timeline 2010 or later.

References

- [1] Commission of the European Communities: e-Health – making healthcare better for European citizens: An action plan for a European e-Health Area. 2004. Available from: http://europa.eu.int/information_society/doc/qualif/health/COM_2004_0356_F_EN_ACTE.pdf (accessed 2006-11-21)
- [2] Commission of the European Communities: eEurope 2005: An information society for all. 2002. Available from: http://europa.eu.int/information_society/eeurope/2002/news_library/documents/eeurope2005/eeurope2005_en.pdf (accessed 2006-11-21)
- [3] Austrian E-Health-Initiative. Austrian E-Health Strategie (in German). [homepage on the Internet] 2005. Available from: <http://ehi.adv.at> (accessed 2006-11-21).
- [4] Van Bommel JH, van Ginneken AM, Stam B, van Mulligen E. Virtual Electronic Patient Records for Shared Care. MedInfo 1998; vol 9, Pt 1: 37-4 (suppl).
- [5] Haux R, Ammenwerth E, Herzog W, Knaup P. Health care in the information society. A prognosis for the year 2013. Int J Med Inform 2002;66(1-3):3–21.
- [6] eHEALTH IMPACT. Website: www.ehealth-impact.org (accessed 2007-12-04).
- [7] Stroetmann K, Jones T, Dobrev A, Stoetmann V: eHealth is Worth it: The economic benefits of implemented eHealth solutions at ten European sites. ISBN 92-79-02762-X, European Communities, September 2006. Available from: http://europa.eu.int/information_society/activities/health/docs/publications/ehealthimpactsept2006.pdf (accessed 2006-11-07)
- [8] Wilson P, Lessens V: Rising to the challenges of eHealth across Europe's regions. eHealth Conference 2006. Available from: http://europa.eu.int/information_society/activities/health/docs/events/ehealth2006malaga/ehealth2006rising_challenges_ehealth_europe_regions.pdf (accessed 2006-11-22)
- [9] Commission of the European Communities, Information Society & Media DG: Connected health – Quality and safety for European Citizens, 2006, http://europa.eu.int/information_society/activities/health/docs/publications/ehealthimpactsept2006.pdf (accessed 2006-11-07)
- [10] Bernnat R: Endbericht zur Kosten-Nutzen-Analyse der Einrichtung einer Telematik-Infrastruktur im deutschen Gesundheitswesen. Booz Allen Hamilton, 2006. Available from: <http://www.ccc.de/updates/2006/gesundheitskartenfuckup> (accessed 2007-12-03).

Address for correspondence

Dr. Raimund Vogl (Raimund.Vogl@umit.at)

UMIT - Research Division eHealth, Eduard Wallnöfer Zentrum 1, A-6060 Hall, Austria