08/16/2012 EDXL-TEP (special, out of schedule)subcommittee meeting

Attendees:

Werner Joerg

Tim Grapes

Patti Aymond

Rex Brooks

Darrell Odonnell

NOTE: These meeting minutes are written in the original TEP OASIS template. This template contains highlighted notes and action items for development of certain content. Other action item references refer to the actual TEP committee working draft 02, where the OASIS editor (Werner Joerg) has highlighted areas of potential issue or inconsistency.

**AGENDA:**

* Review TEP template, content completed to date, and outstanding action items
* Determine next steps and schedule to initiate Subcommittee review, and vote for submission to the EM-TC for vote

1. Patti/Rex: Graphic of the TEP model. Werner suggests that the visual is overloaded and not useful. Suggests it be broken into 3 additional sub-sections for easier reference and understandability. Tim feels it is non-normative and good for quick reference and understanding of overall entities and relationships as is.
   1. Patti/Rex: Meet to determine best approach at this juncture for submission into public review, and modify as you see fit.
2. Data Dictionary
   1. Werner identified (highlighted in yellow in latest version working draft 02), inconsistencies between the data dictionary and the schema.
   2. Brian: (after Werner completes mark-ups ETA Monday Aug. 20) Request review / confirmation of which artifact is correct / takes precedence, make changes to the schema where appropriate. Also, some naming is different and must be resolved.
   3. TBD resource: Make changes to the committee spec DD based on the outcome of Brian’s analysis
3. Tim: Complete the “Usage Scenarios” section
   1. Cover here and sentence in DE section: Usage of multiple TEP message within one DE
4. Tim: Section 3.4 “TEP elements” – Determine what goes here.
5. DE section: Decouple such that any DE changes do not affect the TEP standard. Only discuss usage of DE which assists required TEP functionality
6. Brian: Werner identified areas in the schema where the design is “flat” e.g. “age” and feels we need structure. He will ID other such areas
   1. Need to verify whether these were explicit decisions for simplicity of development and use, or an oversight.
7. Data Dictionary: In reference to the last meeting notes (excerpt below), Werner has reverted back to the Data Dictionary format and methodology utilized in all previous EDXL standards  
   ---

Reference: section 4.3 TEP Message in the Data Dictionary

Werner would like to change the way Data Dictionaries are specified, in his opinion to simplify for reference by implementers. Werner took a different approach to the Data Dictionary than has been pursued in any of the previous standards, simply put by specifying types vs. specification of specific elements and element definitions, and then define complex elements with sub-elements, and then define each (sub) element.

Patti and Werner were the primary debaters, and will not attempt to capture the approach and differences here. To be further discussed as the call went long. Clear opinions are on the table with Werner, Patti and Tim. Need to come to a decision, or raise the issue to the EM-TC level as it alters our consistent approach to previous standards.

---
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# Introduction

All text is normative unless otherwise labeled.

## Purpose

The ongoing goal of the Emergency Data eXchange Language (EDXL) project is to facilitate emergency information sharing and data exchange across the local, state, tribal, national and non-governmental organizations of different professions that provide emergency response and management services. EDXL accomplishes this goal by focusing on the standardization of specific messages (messaging interfaces) to facilitate emergency communication and coordination particularly when more than one profession or governmental jurisdiction is involved.

The current roster of EDXL Standards includes:

The Common Alerting Protocol v1.2 specification (EDXL-CAP), with various dedicated profiles

The Distribution Element Specification v2.0 (EDXL-DE)

The Hospital AVailability Exchange specification v1.0 (EDXL-HAVE)

The Resource Messaging specification v1.0 (EDXL-RM)

The Situation Reporting specification v1.0 (EDXL-SitRep)

The primary purpose of EDXL-TEP is an XML messaging standard for exchange of emergency client (patient) and tracking information during patient encounter through admission or release. TEP supports patient tracking across the EMS emergency medical care continuum, as well as hospital evacuations and patient transfers, providing real-time information to responders, Emergency Management, coordinating organizations and care facilities in the chain of care and transport.

The TEP purpose is intended as part of a larger effort **for tracking everyone affected by and requiring emergency service or assistance as a result of a mass casualty incident**, but is aimed at increased effectiveness of emergency medical management, patient tracking, and continued patient care capabilities during emergency care. TEP is driven by cross-profession practitioner needs (Practitioner Steering Group), and led by the National Association of State EMS Officials (NASEMSO). It supports select goals of the HHS-Agency for Health and Research Quality (AHRQ) and some gaps identified by the Health Information Technology Standards Panel (HITSP).

## History

TIM

## Structure of the EDXL Tracking of Emergency Patients Specification

WAIT UNTIL WHOLE DOC IS COMPLETE AND DESCRIBE HERE…)

### …

### Common Types

Supporting Element Types borrow re-usable elements from the EDXL Common Types that apply to and support multiple areas of the TEP 1.0 messages, such as Location. For instance incidentLocation relies on the EDXL-CIQ profile for geopolitical info and on the EDXL-GSF profile for geographical information.

The Supporting Elements Model distinguishes three groups of elements: CommonTypes (EDXL-CT), Contact Information (EDXL-CIQ) and Location Information (EDXL-GSF).

The following elements are used in this specification and can be found at the locations cited in the normative references in Section 1.6 below.

| Supporting Element | Defined In |
| --- | --- |
| EDXLLocationType | EDXL-CT |
| EDXLGeoLocationType | EDXL-GSF |
| EDXLGeoPoliticalLocationType | EDXL-CT |
| ValueListURI | EDXL-CT |
| Value | EDXL-CT |

## Terminology

The key words “MUST”, “MUST NOT”, “REQUIRED”, “SHALL”, “SHALL NOT”, “SHOULD”, “SHOULD NOT”, “RECOMMENDED”, “MAY”, and “OPTIONAL” in this document are to be interpreted as described in .

PLAN IN THE DATA DICTONARY TO USE THE MORE PRECISE ANNOTATIONS, E.G. [1..\*]…

In addition, within this Specification, the keyword “CONDITIONAL” should be interpreted as potentially “REQUIRED” or “OPTIONAL” depending on the surrounding context. The term payload refers to some body of information contained in the distribution element. The term “REQUIRED” means that empty elements or NULL values are NOT allowed.

## Normative References

(ADD HAVE AS A NORMATIVE REFERENCE)

[RFC2046] N. Freed, Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Two: Media Types, <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2046.txt>, IETF RFC 2046, November 1996.

[RFC2119] S. Bradner, Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels, <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt>, IETF RFC 2119, March 1997.

RFC3066] H. Alvestrand, Tags for the Identification of Languages, <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3066.txt>, IETF RFC 3066, January 2001.

[WGS 84] National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense World Geodetic System 1984, <http://earth-info.nga.mil/GandG/publications/tr8350.2/tr8350_2.html>, NGA Technical Report TR8350.2, January 2000.

[XML 1.0] T. Bray, Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Third Edition), <http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml/>, W3C REC-XML-20040204, February 2004.

[namespaces] T. Bray, Namespaces in XML, <http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml-names/>, W3C REC-xml-names-19990114, January 1999.

[dateTime] N. Freed, XML Schema Part 2: Datatypes Second Edition, <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema-2/#dateTime>, W3C REC-xmlschema-2, October 2004.

[xlink] S. DeRose et al, XML Linking Language (Xlink) Version 1.1, <http://www.w3.org/TR/xlink11/>, W3C REC-xlink11, May 2010.

[EDXL-CIQ] W. Joerg, *OASIS Committee Specification Draft Emergency Data Exchange Language Customer Information Quality* [http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/edxl-ciq/v1.0/csd02/](http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/edxl-ciq/v1.0/csd01/) , September, 2011

[EDXL-CT] W. Joerg, *OASIS Committee Specification Draft Emergency Data Exchange Language Common Types* [http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/edxl-ct/v1.0/csd02/](http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/edxl-ct/v1.0/csd01/) , November, 2011

[EDXL-GSF] W. Joerg, *OASIS Committee Specification Draft Emergency Data Exchange Language GML Simple Features* <http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/edxl-gsf/v1.0/csd01/> , September, 2011

[EDXL-HAVE] *Emergency Data Exchange Language (EDXL) Hospital AVailablity Exchange.*. OASIS Standard 01 http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/edxlhave/v1.0/emergency\_edxl\_have-1.0.html, 1 November 2008

[**EDXL-RM]** *Emergency Data Exchange Language (EDXL) Resource Messaging*. OASIS Standard. V1.0. http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/edxl-rm/v1.0/errata/EDXL-RM-v1.0-OS-errata-os.html*,* 1 November 2008

**[EDXL-SitRep]** *Emergency Data Exchange Language Situation Reporting (EDXL-SitRep) Version 1.0*. 4 May 2012. OASIS Committee Specification Draft 01 / Working Draft 18.

## Non-Normative References

[**EDXL** General Functional Requirements]

EDXL General Functional Requirements, <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=10031&wg_abbrev=emergency>, November 2004.

[EDXL Distribution Element Implementer's Guide]

EDXL Distribution Element Implementer's Guide, <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?document_id=14120&wg_abbrev=emergency>, August 2005

# Design Principles & Concepts (non-normative)

## Design Philosophy

WERNER PULL IN BOILER PLATE FROM SITREP, THEN WE TAILOR FOR TEP

## Requirements for Design

## Example Usage Scenarios

TIM TAILOR THIS SECTION

# EDXL Tracking of Emergency Patients (normative unless stated otherwise)

(TIM - ADD HERE DESCRIPTION CONTEXT, USAGE AND RELATIONSHIP / USE OF HAVE (OTHERS??) WITH TEP – END USER PERSPECTIVE)

## Element Reference Model (non-normative)

REX TO CLEAN UP DIRECT OUTPUT FROM ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT ELIMINATES DUPLICATIVE BOXES AND LINES, STRUCTURE…

PATTI TO REVIEW AND FURTHER SIMPLIFY IF NEEDED

(TIM?) TEXTUAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ERM – NOTATION AND CONTENT

## Distribution of EDXL-TEP

The primary purpose of the Emergency Data Exchange Language Tracking of Emergency Patients (EDXL-TEP) Specification is to provide an XML messaging standard for exchange of emergency client (patient) and tracking information during patient encounter through admission or release, tracking across the EMS emergency medical care continuum, as well as hospital evacuations and patient transfers. These EDXL-TEP messages are specifically designed as payloads of the EDXL-DE. Together EDXL-DE and EDXL-TEP are intended to providing real-time information to responders, Emergency Management, coordinating organizations and care facilities in the chain of care and transport.. As set forth in Design Principles, routing and distribution information is found only in the EDXL-DE and not in the EDXL-TEP.

While the EDXL-TEP is designed to be an EDXL-DE payload, other routing mechanisms may be used to distribute EDXL-TEP content if the message metadata is provided in the same form or if the sender specifies specific recipients of the payload.

### EDXL Distribution Element (EDXL-DE)

TEP DESIGNED TO BE ROUTED USING THE DE, BUT IF ANOTHER ROUTING/TRANSPORT MECHANISM IS USED,

CHECK TEP DOCUMENTATION DESCRIBING DE ELEMENTS MEET TEP RQMTS … NON-NORMATIVE

NOTE: DATA DICTORY REFERRES TO REQUIRED ELEMENTS IN ROUTING / TRANSPORT MECHANISM NEEDED IF DE NOT USED. PREFER DE, BUT IF NOT USED, THEN HERE IS WHAT IS REQUIRED… SEE RM AND SITREP

IF NOT HAPPY WITH HOW HANDLED IN SITREP AND RM, THEN CONSIDER A SUB-SECTION IN THE DATA DICTIONARY WHICH REFERS TO ROUTING ELEMENTS REQUIRED FOR TEP

EDXL Distribution Element (EDXL-DE) V 2.0 was approved as an OASIS standard in … 2012. The EDXL-DE provides a flexible message-distribution framework for data sharing among emergency information systems using XML. The EDXL-DE may be used over any data transmission system, including, but not limited to, the SOAP HTTP binding.

The primary purpose of the Distribution Element is to facilitate the routing of emergency messages to recipients. The Distribution Element may be thought of as a container. It provides the information to route "payload" message sets by including key routing information such as distribution type, geography, incident, and sender/recipient IDs. Messages may be distributed to specific recipients, to recipients in a geographic area, or based on codes such as agency type (police, fire, etc.).

The following subsections describe practitioner requirements which are met through the EDXL-Distribution Element (DE)

#### Identifying MessageType

The Requirement for identifying the “Message Type” of the EDXL-TEP is handled by the <distributionType> element of EDXL-DE v2.0.

The <distributionType> element defines the function of the message and this functional name for the EDXL-TEP “Message Type” takes the form of an XML enumeration where the value must be one of:

Report - New information regarding an incident or activity. (??)

Update - Updated information superseding a previous message.

Cancel - A cancellation or revocation of a previous message.

Request - A request for resources, information or action.

Response - A response to a previous request.

Ack - Acknowledgment of receipt of an earlier message.

Error - Rejection of an earlier message (for technical reasons).

#### Identifying Message Sender

The Requirement for identifying the “Message Sender” of the EDXL-SitRep is handled by one or two elements of EDXL-DE v2.0.The EDXL-DE v2.0 <senderID> or an element with the identical definition and properties MUST be present in the EDXL-DE or other routing mechanism used to distribute an EDXL-TEP message. The <senderRole> or an element with the identical definition and properties MAY be present.

<senderRole> is expressed in an XML ValueList and Value.

The list and associated value(s) is in the form:

   <senderRole>

      <valueListUrn>valueListUrn</valueListUrn>

      <value>value</value>

   </senderRole>

Where the content of <valueListUrn> is the Uniform Resource Name of a published list of values and definitions, and the content of <value> is a string (which may represent a number) denoting the value itself.

Multiple instances of the <value>, MAY occur with a single <valueListUrn> within the <senderRole> container.

#### DateTime Message Sent

The EDXL-DE v1.0 <dateTimeSent> element is used to established the date and time the EDXL-DE package contained the EDXL-SitRep message is sent.

DateTime elements are represented consistent with previous EDXL standards (24-hour clock):

The date and time is represented in [DateTime] format (e. g., "2008-06-11T16:49:00-07:00" for 11 June 2008 at 16:49 PDT).

Alphabetic time zone designators such as “Z” MUST NOT be used. The time zone for UTC MUST be represented as “-00:00” or “+00:00

other …

## Attachments

## TEP Elements

# Data Dictionary (normative)

The data dictionary is intended to provide detailed definition of each element contained in the EDXL-TEP standard.  Where discrepancies may exist between this dictionary, the Element Reference Model (ERM), and the normative schema, the normative schema shall take precedence.

**Element** / **ElementType**– Name of the element.

**Type** – Type or format of the element.

**Usage** – Optionality and Cardinality.

If no optionality specified, then the element is “Optional”.

If no Cardinality specified, the element “MUST be used once and only once”

**Definition** – Definition of the element.

**Comments** – Additional comments or examples to add clarity.

**Constraints** – Limits imposed on the element.  Also notes the container or “parent” to which the element belongs.

**Valid Values / Examples** – ...

**Sub-elements** – List of references to elements that are part of this element

**Used In** – Source of the requirement or usage of the element.

**Requirements Supported** – A code representing and referring to each requirement contained in the original submission from the practitioner process to OASIS. EACH general, functional or information requirement is accounted for by one or more elements in the data dictionary, and/or by relationships in the message structure, one or more business rules, or through the overall standard (e.g. for general and functional requirements).

## Routing Header

Probably doesn’t belong here – 1- this is DE, and 2- don’t include parent/top level element in the DD

Discuss later whether any DE elements belong in the DD at all – even in a separate reference section

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element** | **RoutingHeader** |
| Type | xsd:complexType |
| Usage | [0..1] |
| Definition | Group of elements used for message routing. |
| Comments | Assumed to use EDXL-DE or equivalent required elements and structure. |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | Valid Values: Report, Update, Cancel, Request, Response, Ack, Error |
| Sub-elements | * distributionType [1..1]: DistributionType * senderID [1..1]: SenderID * senderRole [0..\*]: SenderRole * dateTimeSent [1..1]: DateTimeSent |
| Used In | EDXL-DE |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **DistributionType** |
| Type | xs:string |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | The function of the message value must be one of:  a. Report - New information regarding an incident or activity.  b. Update - Updated information superseding a previous message.  c. Cancel - A cancellation or revocation of a previous message.  d. Request - A request for resources, information or action.  e. Response - A response to a previous request.  f. Ack - Acknowledgment of receipt of an earlier message.  g. Error - Rejection of an earlier message (for technical reasons). |
| Comments | 1. Note that where an existing EDXL-DE element meets a stated practitioner requirement, that element will NOT be replicated, duplicated or referred to in the body of a TEP Message. The assumption and rule is that the EDXL-DE or equivalent will be used to route TEP messages, and therefore these requirements are met by the DE.  2. The EDXL-DE, “distributionType” element meets this requirement. Each of the values above will be treated as an enumeration in the EA tool.  3. Note: Suggestion to add “Test” as a value in the DE version discussions (however, note that the DE already contains “distributionStatus” of Actual, Exercise, System and Test. Need to confirm this will meet the need.) |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | Valid Values: Report, Update, Cancel, Request, Response, Ack, Error |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-DE |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **SenderID** |
| Type | xs:string |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | Unique identifier of the sender. |
| Comments | 1. Uniquely identifies human parties, systems, services, or devices that are all potential senders of the distribution message.  2. In the form actor@domain-name.  3. Uniqueness of the domain-name is guaranteed through use of the Internet Domain Name System, and uniqueness of the actor name enforced by the domain owner.  4. The identifier MUST be a properly formed - escaped if necessary - XML string. |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | Example: dispatcher@example.gov, 0006.0e39.ad80@example.com |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-DE |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **SenderRole** |
| Type | ValueListURI: xsd:AnyURI  Value: xsd:String [1..\*] |
| Usage | [0..\*] |
| Definition | The functional role of the sender, as it may determine message routing decisions or help to identify the message sender. |
| Comments | 1. The list and associated value(s) is in the form:  <senderRole>  <valueListURI>valueListURI</valueListURI>  <value>value</value>  </senderRole>  where the content of <valueListURI> is the Uniform Resource Identifier of a published list of values and definitions, and the content of <value> is a string (which may represent a number) denoting the value itself.  2. Multiple instances of the <value>, MAY occur with a single <valueListURI> within the <senderRole> container.  3. Multiple instances of <senderRole> MAY occur within a single <EDXLDistribution> container. |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-DE |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **DateTimeSent** |
| Type | xsd:dateTime |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | The functional role of the sender, as it may determine message routing decisions or help to identify the message sender. |
| Comments | 1. The list and associated value(s) is in the form:  <senderRole>  <valueListURI>valueListURI</valueListURI>  <value>value</value>  </senderRole>  where the content of <valueListURI> is the Uniform Resource Identifier of a published list of values and definitions, and the content of <value> is a string (which may represent a number) denoting the value itself.  2. Multiple instances of the <value>, MAY occur with a single <valueListURI> within the <senderRole> container.  3. Multiple instances of <senderRole> MAY occur within a single <EDXLDistribution> container. |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-DE |
| Requirements Supported |  |

## Attachments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element** | **Attachment** |
| Type | xsd:complexType |
| Usage | [0..\*] |
| Definition | Capability to carry "attachments" noted with a TEP message.(non-XML content or other non-TEP XML content) . |
| Comments | Assumed to use EDXL-DE or equivalent required elements and structure. |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements | * clientPhotograph [0..\*]: ClientPhotograph * clientFingerprint [0..1]: ClientFingerprint * clienthealthRecord [0..\*]: ClientHealthRecord |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **ClientPhotograph** |
| Type | ? |
| Usage | [0..\*] |
| Definition | Photograph of client(patient) |
| Comments | May use the EDXL-DE ContentObject |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **ClientFingerprint** |
| Type | ? |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | Fingerprint of client(patient). |
| Comments | May be attached to the EDXL-DE |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **ClientHealthRecord** |
| Type | ? |
| Usage | [0..\*] |
| Definition | A copy of the client(patient)'s electronic health record or other structured information elements (e.g. additional NEMSIS or HL-7 selected elements - ValueListURN) |
| Comments | May be attached to the EDXL-DE |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

## TEP Message

DEBATED WERNER’S METHODOLOGY BELOW OF SPECIFYING TYPES, VS. ALL PREVIOUS EDXL STANDARDS WHICH SPECIFY ELEMENTS AND ELEMENT DEFINITIONS, AND THEN DEFINE COMPLEX ELEMENTS WITH SUB-ELEMENTS, AND THEN DEFINE EACH (SUB) ELEMENT.

PATTI AND TIM FEEL PREVIOUS METHODOLOGY (USED FOR ALL EDXL STANDARDS) SHOULD BE APPLIED FOR EASE OF REFERENCE, SIMPLIFICATION, AND CONSISTENCY. WERNER WANTS TO CHANGE THE WAY DATA DICTIONARIES ARE SPECIFIED.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element** | **TEPMessage** |
| Type | xsd:complexType |
| Usage | ?? |
| Definition | Group of elements used to uniquely identify a TEP message and its source. |
| Comments |  |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements | * messageID [1..1]: tep:MessageID * systemID [0..1]: tep:SystemID * client [1..1]: tep:ClientType |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **MessageID** |
| Type | ct:EDXLStringType [1..1] |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | Each TEP message contains an identifier that uniquely identifies the message |
| Comments | 1. The TEP Element contains the "Distribution ID", which identifies the "container" for the distribution message information.  2. Same element as EDXL-RM, EDXL SitRep |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-SitRep, EDXL-RM |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **SystemID** |
| Type | ct:EDXLStringType [0..1] |
| Usage | [0..1] |
| Definition | A unique system id, or login credentials of person entering TEP data, used to identify source of the information |
| Comments |  |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

### Client (Patient)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **ClientType** |
| Type | xsd:complexType |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | Group of elements associated with the person that has been encountered and determined or suspected to be a patient. Used to uniquely identify and describe the person |
| Comments | About personalID:   1. Definition: describes Type and form of personal Identification; 2. Note: ID Number and State Issuing Drivers License is captured in PersonDetailsType – TEP may carry multiple forms of identification. This element may also be used in a ContentObject in the DE to uniquely identify attachments and other information such as a photograph. Where possible, an existing vetted list should be offered as defaults, but allow users to extend values on that list, or to use their own value list. |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples |  |
| Sub-elements | * clientUniqueID [1..\*]: tep:ClientUniqueID * gender [1..1]: tep:Gender * raceEthnicity [1..\*]: tep:RaceEthnicity * clientAge [1..1]: tep:ClientAge * dateOfBirth [0..1]: xs:date * personalID [0..1]: tep:PersonalID * hairColor [0..1]: tep:HairColor * eyeColor [0..1]: tep:EyeColor * distinguishingMarks [0..1]: tep:DistinguishingMarks * primarySpokenLanguage [0..1]: tep:PrimarySpokenLanguage * *… more* |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **ClientUniqueID** |
| Type | xsd:complexType |
| Usage | [1..\*] |
| Definition | Pairs ID and ID source:   1. ID: A number or code issued to each client(patient) encountered; used as a unique identifier of the patient. 2. A notation identifying the source of the client(patient)'s unique identification number, to describe the source (who, what or where) that created the clientUniqueIDNumber. |
| Comments | 1. ID: The clientUniqueIDNumber element may also be used in a ContentObject in the DE to uniquely identify attachments and other information such as a photograph. This element is always paired with clientUniqueIDNumberSource whether one or multiple instances of the pair are used. 2. ID source:This element is always paired with clientUniqueIDNumber whether one or multiple instances of the pair are used. |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | "Source" Example: State of Maryland, JPTAS System, Hampshire County, WV, State of TN, NDMS etc. |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **Gender** |
| Type | ct:ValueKeyType |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | The client(patient) gender |
| Comments | Where possible, an existing vetted list should be offered as defaults, but allow users to extend values on that list, or to use their own value list. NOTE: Data Type is intended to specify an enumerated list of values to choose from… |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | Valid Values: Male, Female, Unknown |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **RaceEthnicity** |
| Type | ct:ValueListType |
| Usage | [0..\*] |
| Definition | The client(patient) race/ethnicity as defined by the OMB (US Office of Management and Budget) |
| Comments | Where possible, an existing vetted list should be offered as defaults, but allow users to extend values on that list, or to use their own value list (NOTE: check Usage in the referenced OMB standard) |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | Example: White, African American, Asian, Hispanic/Latino |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **ClientAge** |
| Type | xsd:complexType |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition | Pairs age and estimated   1. The client(patient) age, either calculated from date of birth or best approximation is appropirate in situations where it is not possible to ascertain exact age. 2. Estimated: valid values Y, N 3. Choice of  * units: The units which the age is documented in * unitsDefault: Default age units |
| Comments | Complex Type top level "clientAge" contains age, Estimated, and ageUnits.  About units/unitsDefault: where possible, an existing vetted list should be offered as defaults, but allow users to extend values on that list, or to use their own value list |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | Valid values for   * Units: Hours, Days, Months, Years * unitsDefaults: Hours, Days, Months, Years |
| Sub-elements | * age [1..1]: xs:unsignedint * estimated [0..1]: ct:EstimateType * *choice*: * units [1..1]: ct:ValueKeyType |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Element****Type** | **PersonalID** |
| Type | ct:PersonDetailsType |
| Usage | [1..1] |
| Definition |  |
| Comments |  |
| Constraints |  |
| Valid Values / Examples | Examples: Drivers License, Social Security Card, Passport, Military ID, etc |
| Sub-elements |  |
| Used In | EDXL-TEP |
| Requirements Supported |  |

### Situation

### Care Provider

### Transport

### Client Encounter

### Client Care

### Client Transfer

## Glossary / List of Acronyms

NOTE: Glossary definitions contained herein are not intended to supersede existing definitions by any other organization or agency.  Rather, these glossary items are provided in context of defining the EDXL-TEP draft messaging standard - solely in order to clarify requirements statements.

**TERM OR ACRONYM**    DEFINITION

**ACH**           Automated Clearing House

**Ack**            Acknowledgment

**CAD**           Computer Aided Dispatch

**CAP**           Common Alerting Protocol

**CBRNE**       Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear

**CDC**           Center For Disease Control

**CIQ**            Customer Information Quality (a “contact information” standard)

**Complex Incident**         A “complex” incident refers to “a series of situations or events that result in one incident” (Source:  NIMS).  Put another way, a complex incident may consist of one or more independently identified events and/or situations and/or incidents that require tracking and information exchange both as individual occurrences and combined for the overall incident”.

**Constraint Schema**       A constraint schema is simply a subset of the standard reference schema which conforms to all the requirements and business rules of the reference schema.  For example, an implementation of the TEP standard may eliminate selected optional elements, or enhance the definition of a required element.

**CSTE**         Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists

**DE**              Distribution Element

**DHS**           Department of Homeland Security

**DOT**           Department of Transportation

**EDXL**         Emergency Data eXchange Language -

**EDXL-DE**    Emergency Data eXchange Language - Distribution Element

**EDXL-HAVE**     Emergency Data eXchange Language - Hospital aVailability Exchange

**EDXL-RM**   Emergency Data eXchange Language - Resource Messaging

**EIC**             Emergency Interoperability Consortium

**Elemen**t     “Elements” are logical groupings of message elements or “tags” for purposes of defining message structure

**EMT**           Emergency Medical Technician

**ERM**           Element Reference Model

**ESF**            Emergency Support Functions

**ETA**            Estimated Time of Arrival

**Event**         For purposes of this messaging standard, “Situations”, “Incidents” and “Events” will be  referred to generally as “incidents”.   Situations in this context refer to occurrences of various scales - a collection of happenings, observations and actions that have been correlated on some basis that may require resources to perform Public Safety/Emergency/Disaster mitigation, planning and preparation, response or recovery.

It is a generic term referring to occurrences of any scale that may require some form of Emergency Response and Management, and that requires tracking and information exchange.  An Event is a planned situation (e.g. a parade in Washington DC).  “Event” is also used to refer to a situation that has not been formally identified as an incident.  Like an incident, may be assigned an official ID, name or other descriptive attributes. EDXL-TEP may refer to any situation whether an incident, event or other occurance.

**FEMA**         Federal Emergency Management Agency

**HazMat**       Hazardous Materials

**HITSP**        Health Information Technology Standards Panel

**HTTP**          Hypertext Transfer Protocol

**ICS**             Incident Command System

**ID**               Identification

**IEEE**          Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

**IEPD**          Information Exchange Package Development

**Incident**      For purposes of this messaging standard, “Situations”, “Incidents” and “Events” will be  referred to generally as “incidents”.   Situations in this context refer to occurrences of various scales - a collection of happenings, observations and actions that have been correlated on some basis that may require resources to perform Public Safety/Emergency/Disaster mitigation, planning and preparation, response or recovery.

A Situation can be an incident, an event, or any observable or predictable occurrence.  It is a generic term referring to occurrences of any scale that may require some form of Emergency Response and Management, and that requires tracking and information exchange.

“Incident” is viewed from the NIMS Emergency Management perspective as a formal or informal declaration of emergency or disaster by an organization at the state, local, federal level or by a jurisdiction.  An incident may be assigned an official ID, name or other descriptive attributes. EDXL-TEP may refer to any situation whether an incident, event or other situation or occurance.

**Jurisdiction**      In context of emergency response to incidents, “jurisdiction” has two similar definitions:

1.   Reference to a geo-political area or location.  A jurisdiction is pre-defined physical location or area over which legal authority extends.  Though a jurisdiction itself is not a person, role, or title, a jurisdiction has assigned to it one or more government personnel with legal authority for certain types of decision-making such as allocation of emergency resources and invocation of mutual aid agreements.

2.   Reference to an organization or agency that has “Authority” over something (such as an incident, or a set of identified resources).  Jurisdiction in this sence may be general, such as “federal”, “city”, or “state”, or may be specific agency names such as “Warren County”, “US Coast Guard”, “Panama City”, and “NYPD”.

**MACS**         Multi-Agency Coordination System

**MC**             Mobile Command

**MEMA**        Maryland Emergency Management Agency

**NCR DEH**    National Capital Region Data Exchange Hub

**NFES**         National Fire Equipment System

**NIEM**          National Information Exchange Model

**NIMS**          National Information Management System

**OASIS**        Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards

**OIC**            Office for Interoperability and Compatability

**Profile**        (Taken from the OGC)

(Note:  Considerable confusion exists in discussion and definition of the concept of a “profile”.  The following definition was submitted by the OGC; however reference within this document more closely conforms to the term “constraint schema”.)

A profile of GML can be defined to enhance interoperability and to curtail ambiguity by allowing only a specific subset of GML.  Application schemas can then conform to such a profile in order to take advantage of any interoperability or performance advantages that it offers in comparison with a complete GML. Such profiles can be defined for application schemas that are included in other OGC specifications. There are cases where reduced functionality is acceptable, or where processing requirements compel use of a logical subset of GML. For example, applications that do not need to handle XLink attributes in any form can adhere to a specific profile that excludes them; the constraint in this case would be to not use links. Other cases might include defining constraints on the level of nesting allowed inside tags (i.e. tree depth), or only allowing features with homogeneous properties as members of a feature collection. In many cases, such constraints can be enforced via new schemas; others may be enforced through procedural agreements within an information community.

**PSG**           Practitioner Steering Group

**RM**             Resource Messaging

**S&T**            Science and Technology Directorate of DHS

**SAFECOM**  SAFECOM is a communications program within the Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) that provides research, development, testing and evaluation, guidance, tools, and templates on communications-related issues to local, tribal, state, and Federal emergency response agencies working to improve emergency response through more effective and efficient interoperable wireless communications.

**SitRep**        Situation Report

**Situation**    For purposes of this messaging standard, “Situations”, “Incidents” and “Events” will be  referred to generally as “incidents”.   Situations in this context refer to occurrences of various scales - a collection of happenings, observations and actions that have been correlated on some basis that may require resources to perform Public Safety/Emergency/Disaster mitigation, planning and preparation, response or recovery.

A Situation can be an incident, an event, or any observable or predictable occurrence.  It is a generic term referring to occurrences of any scale that may require some form of Emergency Response and Management, and that requires tracking and information exchange.

**SOAP**         Simple Object Access Protocol

**SWG**          Standards Working Group -

**UCUM**         Unified Code for Units of Measure

**UOM**           Units of Measure

**URN**           Uniform Resource Name

**UTC**            Coordinated Universal Time

**WHO**          World Health Organization

**WMD**          Weapons of Mass Destruction

**XML**     eXtensible Markup Language
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