Object Management Group

Framingham Corporate Center
492 Old Connecticut Path
Framingham, MA 01701-4568

Telephone: +1-508-820 4300
Facsimile: +1-508-820 4303

CORBAmed Domain Task Force RFP-1

Patient Identification Services

Request For Proposal

OMG Document: corbamed/96-11-02

Letters of Intent due: February 14, 1997
Submissions due: April 14, 1997

Objective of this RFP

Throughout an individual's lifetime, they may have episodes of care provided by hundreds of healthcare providing organizations (e.g. hospitals, medical centers, Dr. offices, etc.). These organizations maintain medical records for the patients they have cared for. When a patient comes into a healthcare organization for care, there is a need to find the records for any previous care that patient had with the institution. Each healthcare provider may have used a different scheme (e.g. numbering system) to identify the patient. The system used for identifying a patient is called a Master Patient Index (MPI).

In addition it is desirable to combine the medical records from multiple institutions in order to show a complete picture of a person's health record. This need to combine records from different organizations has increased dramatically in the last few years due to consolidations and collaborations between providers.

Because of the rapid change in the healthcare environment within the last few years the systems and standards needed to satisfy this need to share patient records do not yet exist. One of the major impediments to this sharing of patient records between organizations is a lack in the ability to identify a patient in a consistent manner. Due to this inability there is no standard way today to combine a patient's records from multiple institutions.

This RFP solicits proposals for specifications for the common features of a patient identification system that allows multiple of these patient identification systems to interoperate.

For further details see Chapter 6 of this document.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Goals of OMG

The Object Management Group (OMG) is the world's largest software consortium with a membership of over 600 vendors, developers, and end users. Established in 1989, its mission is to promote the theory and practice of Object Technology (OT) for the development of distributed computing systems.

A key goal of OMG is create a standardized object-oriented architectural framework for distributed applications based on specifications that enable and support distributed objects. Objectives include the *reusability*, *portability*, and *interoperability* of object-oriented software components in heterogeneous environments.To this end, the OMG adopts interface and protocol specifications, based on commercially available object technology, that together define an Object Management Architecture (OMA).

1.2 Organization of this document

The remainder of this document is organized as follows:

Chapter 2 - *Architectural Context* - background information on OMG's Object Management Architecture.

Chapter 3 - *Adoption Process* - background information on the OMG specification adoption process.

Chapter 4 - *Instructions for Submitters* - explanation of how to make a submission to this RFP.

Chapter 5 - *General Requirements on Proposals* - requirements and evaluation criteria that apply to all proposals submitted to OMG.

Chapter 6 - *Specific Requirements on Proposals* - problem statement, scope of proposals sought, mandatory and optional requirements, issues to be discussed, evaluation criteria, and timetable that apply specifically to this RFP.

Additional RFP-specific chapters may also be included following Chapter 6.

1.3 References

The following documents are referenced in this document:

Richard Soley (ed.), *Object Management Architecture Guide,* Third Edition*,* Wiley, June 1995.

The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification, Revision 2.0*,* July 1995.

CORBAservices: Common Object Services Specification, Revised Edition, March 1995.

CORBAfacilities Architecture, Revision 4.0, November 1995.

Business Committee RFP Attachment, OMG Document omg/96-01-01.

Policies and Procedures of the OMG Technical Process, OMG Document pp/96-05-03.

These documents can be obtained by contacting OMG at request@omg.org. Many OMG documents, including this document, are available electronically from OMG's document server. Send a message containing the single line "help" to server@omg.org for more information.

For more information about OMG visit OMG's Web page (URL http://www.omg.org/). If you have general questions about this RFP send email to rfp@omg.org.

2.0 Architectural Context

2.1 Object Management Architecture

The *Object Management Architecture Guide* (OMAG) describes OMG's technical objectives and terminology and provides the conceptual infrastructure upon which supporting specifications are based. The guide includes the *OMG Object Model,* which defines common semantics for specifying the externally visible characteristics of objects in a standard implementation-independent way, and the *OMA Reference Model.*

The Reference Model identifies and characterizes the components, interfaces, and protocols that compose the OMA. This includes the Object Request Broker (ORB) component that enables clients and objects to communicate in a distributed environment, and four categories of object interfaces:

- *Object Services* are interfaces for general services that are likely to be used in any program based on distributed objects.
- *Common Facilities* are interfaces for horizontal end-user-oriented facilities applicable to most application domains.
- *Domain Interfaces* are application domain-specific interfaces.
- *Application Interfaces* are non-standardized application-specific interfaces.

A second part of the Reference Model introduces the notion of domain-specific *Object Frameworks*. An Object Framework component is a collection of cooperating objects that provide an integrated solution within an application or technology domain and which is intended for customization by the developer or user.

Through a series of RFPs, OMG is populating the OMA with detailed specifications for each component and interface category in the Reference Model. Adopted specifications include the Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA), CORBAservices, and CORBAfacilities.

The wide-scale industry adoption of OMG's OMA provides application developers and users with the means to build interoperable software systems distributed across all major hardware, operating system, and programming language environments.

2.2 CORBA

The *Common Object Request Broker Architecture* defines the programming interfaces to the OMA ORB component. An ORB is the basic mechanism by which objects transparently make requests to - and receive responses from - each other on the same machine or across a network. A

client need not be aware of the mechanisms used to communicate with or activate an object, how the object is implemented, nor where the object is located. The ORB thus forms the foundation for building applications constructed from distributed objects and for interoperability between applications in both homogeneous and heterogeneous environments.

The *OMG Interface Definition Language* (IDL) provides a standardized way to define the interfaces to CORBA objects. The IDL definition is the contract between the implementor of an object and the client. IDL is a strongly typed declarative language that is programming language-independent. Language mappings enable objects to be implemented and sent requests in the developer's programming language of choice in a style that is natural to that language.

CORBA 2.0 is an extension and restructuring of the earlier CORBA 1.2 specification. CORBA 2.0 is a family of specifications consisting of the following components:

- Core (including IDL syntax and semantics)
- IDL C language mapping
- IDL C++ language mapping
- IDL SmallTalk language mapping (added in 1995)
- IDL Ada'95 language mapping (added in 1996)
- Interoperability

Each component is a separate compliance point. The minimum required for a CORBA-compliant implementation is adherence to the core and one language mapping.

2.3 CORBA/Interoperability

Interoperability between CORBA-compliant ORBs is provided by OMG's *Internet Inter-ORB Protocol* (IIOP). Adopted in December 1994 as the mandatory CORBA 2.0 protocol for “out of the box” interoperability, IIOP is the TCP/IP transport mapping of a *General Inter-ORB Protocol* (GIOP). IIOP enables requests to be sent to networked objects managed by other ORBs in other domains.

The OMG interoperability architecture also accommodates communication using optional *Environment-Specific IOPs* (ESIOPs), the first of which is the DCE-CIOP.

2.4 CORBAservices

Object Services are general purpose services that are either fundamental for developing useful CORBA-based applications composed of distributed objects, or that provide a universal - application domain-independent - basis for application interoperability.

Object Services are the basic building blocks for distributed object applications. Compliant objects can be combined in many different ways and put to many different uses in applications. They can be used to construct higher level facilities and object frameworks that can interoperate across multiple platform environments.

Adopted OMG Object Services are collectively called CORBAservices and include Naming, Events, LifeCycle, Persistent Object, Relationships, Externalization, Transactions, Concurrency Control, Licensing, Query, Properties, Security, Time, Collections, and Trading Services.

2.5 CORBAfacilities

Common Facilities are interfaces for horizontal end-user-oriented facilities applicable to most domains. Adopted OMG Common Facilities are collectively called CORBAfacilities and include an OpenDoc-based Distributed Document Component Facility.

A specification of a Common Facility or Object Service typically includes the set of interface definitions - expressed in OMG IDL - that objects in various roles must support in order to *provide*, *use,* or *participate in* the facility or service. As with all specifications adopted by OMG, facilities and services are defined in terms of interfaces and their semantics, and not a particular implementation.

2.6 Object Frameworks and Domain Interfaces

Unlike the interfaces to individual parts of the OMA “plumbing” infrastructure, Object Frameworks are complete higher level components that provide functionality of direct interest to end-users in particular application or technology domains. They are vertical slices down the OMG “interface stack”.

Object Frameworks are collections of cooperating objects categorized into *Application, Domain, Facility,* and *Service Objects*. Each object in a framework supports (through interface inheritance) or makes use of (via client requests) some combination of Application, Domain, CORBAfacilities, and CORBAservices *interfaces*.

A specification of an Object Framework defines such things as the structure, interfaces, types, operation sequencing, and qualities of service of the objects that make up the framework. This includes requirements on implementations in order to guarantee application portability and interoperability across different platforms.

Domain Task Force RFPs are likely to focus on Object Framework specifications that include new Domain Interfaces for application domains such as Finance, Healthcare, Manufacturing, Telecom, Electronic Commerce, and Transportation.

3.0 Adoption Process

3.1 Introduction

OMG adopts specifications for interfaces and protocols by explicit vote on a technology-by-technology basis. The specifications selected each fill in a portion of the OMA Reference Model. OMG bases its decisions on both business and technical considerations. Once a specification is adopted by OMG, it is made available for use by both OMG members and non-members.

For more detailed information on the adoption process see the *Policies and Procedures of the OMG Technical Process*.

3.2 Role of Board of Directors

The OMG Board of Directors votes to formally adopt specifications on behalf of OMG. The OMG Technology Committees (Domain and Platform TCs) and Architecture Board (AB) provide technical guidance to the Board of Directors. In addition, the Business Committee of the Board provides guidance to ensure that implementations of adopted specifications are made commercially available.

3.3 Role of Technology Committees and Architecture Board

Submissions to RFPs are evaluated by the TC Task Force (TF) that initiated the RFP. Selected specifications are recommended to the parent TC after being reviewed by the Architecture Board for consistency with the OMA. The full TC then votes to *recommend adoption* to the OMG Board.

3.4 Role of Task Forces

The role of the initiating TF is to technically evaluate submissions and select one or more specifications that satisfy the requirements of the RFP. The process typically takes the following form:

- Voter Registration

  Interested TF members may register to participate in specification selection votes for an RFP. Registration ends on a specified date 6 or more weeks after the announcement of the registration period. The registration closure date is typically around the time of initial submissions. Companies who have submitted an LOI are automatically registered to vote.

- Initial Submissions

  Initial submissions are due by a specified deadline. Submitters normally present their proposals at the next following meeting of the TF. Initial submissions are expected to be full and complete proposals and working implementations of the proposed specifications are expected to exist at the time of submission.

- Evaluation Phase

  A period of approximately 120 days follows during which the TF evaluates the submissions. During this time submitting companies have the opportunity to revise and/or merge their initial submissions, if they so choose.

- Revised Submissions

  Final revised submissions are due by a specified deadline. Submitters again normally present their proposals at the next following meeting of the TF. Finalists may be requested to demonstrate implementations of their proposal.

- Selection Vote

  When the registered voters of the TF believe that they sufficiently understand the relative merits of the revised submissions, a specification selection vote is taken.

3.5 Goals of the evaluation

The primary goals of the TF evaluation process are to:

- Provide a fair and open process
- Force a critical review of the submissions and discussion by all members of the TF
- Give feedback to allow submitters to address concerns in their revised submissions
- Build consensus on acceptable solutions
- Enable voting members to make an informed selection decision

Submitters are expected to actively contribute to the evaluation process.

4.0 Instructions for Submitters

4.1 Submission Effort

Unlike a submission to an OMG Request For Information (RFI), an RFP submission may require significant effort in terms of document preparation, presentations to the initiating TF, and participation in the TF evaluation process. Several staff months of effort might be necessary. OMG is unable to reimburse submitters for any costs in conjunction with their submissions to this RFP.

4.2 Letter of Intent

A Letter of Intent (LOI) must be submitted to the OMG Business Committee signed by an officer of your organization signifying your intent to respond to the RFP and confirming your organization's willingness to comply with OMG's terms and conditions, and commercial availability requirements. These terms, conditions, and requirements are defined in the *Business Committee RFP Attachment* and are reproduced verbatim in section 4.3 below.

The LOI should designate a single contact point within your organization for receipt of all subsequent information regarding this RFP and your submission. The name of this contact will be made available to all OMG members. The LOI is typically due 60 days before the deadline for initial submissions. LOIs must be sent by fax or paper mail to the "RFP Submissions Desk" at the main OMG address shown on the first page of this RFP.

4.3 Business Committee RFP Attachment

Terms and Conditions

The OMG Business Committee has produced a document entitled "OMG Policy on Adoption of Specifications". When reviewing submissions to each RFP, the specific items that the OMG Business Committee will be considering during the selection process are outlined below:

- *The optimization of interoperability and portability goals across multiple platforms.*
- *Commitment by the proposed technology supplier to make the implementation available on commercially reasonable terms, applied in a non discriminatory fashion.*
- *Submission of a Standard License Agreement and Support plans*

- *A preferred, but not required, method for achieving multi-platform interoperability is source code licensing. Please include any provisions as such.*
- *Assurance that the results in the duplication of the "look and feel" of any aspects of such proponents implementations from specifications will not result in infringement or obligation to pay royalties.*
- *Plans for future revisions, enhancements, maintenance.*
- *Agreement to grant the OMG a worldwide copyright including the right to copy and distribute the adopted interface specification(s) at no cost to OMG. Implementations or instantiations of the specifications is owned by the developer.*
- *Upon OMG's acceptance of the sponsoring company's interfaces, the sponsoring company agrees to provide all documentation in an OMG prescribed format and in OMG endorsed terminology.*

Definition of Commercial Availability

For technology to be accepted and adopted by the OMG Board Of Directors (reference OMG document tilted "OMG Policy on Adoption of Specifications - 2/12/90") it must be commercially available within twelve (12) months or less from when the OMG Task Force (prior to the Technical Committee and Board vote) adopted the specification(s). This is required for proof of concept and expedient implementation of actual product and licensing procedures. Commercial availability is delineated as:

- *Technology that has been publicly announced as a product or embodied within another product.*
- *Technology that is of production/manufacturing quality, has cleared a process of product shipment authorization, and can be demonstrated at OMG request (including installation, documentation, service, and support). Demonstrations may be required following RFP presentations to the OMG Technical Committee.*
- *Technology that can be referenced by at least two (2) consumers (customers) of the technology.*

A statement of commercial availability must be accompanied by a letter of authorization by an officer of the company proposing the technology.

4.4 Responding to RFP items

Separate proposals

Unless otherwise indicated in Chapter 6, independent proposals are solicited for each separate item in the RFP. Each item is considered a separate architectural entity for which a proposal may be made. A submitter may respond to any or all items. Each item will be evaluated independently by the initiating TF. Submissions that do not present clearly separable proposals for multiple items may therefore be at a disadvantage.

It should be noted that a given technology (e.g. software product) may support two or more RFP items. So long as the interfaces for each item are separable, this is not precluded.

Complete proposals

Proposals for each separate RFP item must be complete. A submission must propose full specifications for each item and address all the relevant general and specific requirements detailed in this RFP.

Additional specifications

Submissions may include additional specifications for items not covered by the RFP which they believe to be necessary and integral to their proposal. Information on these additional items should be clearly distinguished.

Submitters must give a detailed rationale as to why these specifications should also be considered for adoption. However submitters should note that a TF is unlikely to consider additional items that are already on the roadmap of an OMG TF, since this would preempt the normal adoption process.

Alternative approaches

Submitters may provide alternative RFP item definitions, categorizations, and groupings so long as the rationale for doing so is clearly stated. Equally, submitters may provide alternative models for how items are provided within the OMA if there are compelling technological reasons for a different approach.

4.5 Confidential and Proprietary Information

The OMG specification adoption process is an open process. Responses to this RFP become public documents of the OMG and are available to members and non-members alike for perusal. No confidentiality or proprietary information of any kind will be accepted in a submission to this RFP.

4.6 Copyright Waiver

If a submitted document is copyrighted, a waiver of copyright for unlimited duplication by the OMG is required to be stated in the document. In addition, a limited waiver of copyright is required that allows OMG members to make up to fifty (50) copies of the document for review purposes only.

4.7 Proof of Concept

Submissions must include a “proof of concept” statement, explaining how the submitted specifications have been demonstrated to be technically viable. The technical viability has to do with the state of development and maturity of the technology on which a submission is based. This is not the same as commercial availability. Proof of concept statements can contain any information deemed relevant by the submitter, for example:

> “This specification has completed the design phase and is the process of being prototyped.”
>
> “An implementation of this specification has been in beta-test for 4 months.”
>
> “A named product (with a specified customer base) is a realization of this specification.”

It is incumbent upon submitters to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the TF the technical viability of their proposal. OMG will favor proposals based on technology for which sufficient relevant experience has been gained in CORBA-based or comparable environments.

4.8 Format of RFP Submissions

This section provides guidance on how to structure your RFP submission.

General

- Submissions that are concise and easy to read will inevitably receive more consideration.
- Submitted documentation should be confined to that directly relevant to the items requested in the RFP. If this is not practical, submitters must make clear what portion of the documentation pertains directly to the RFP and what portion does not.
- The models and terminology in the *Object Management Architecture Guide* and *CORBA* should be used in your submission. Where you believe this is not appropriate, describe and provide a rationale for the models and terminology you believe OMG should use.

Suggested Outline

A three part structure for submissions is suggested:

PART I

- Copyright Waiver (see 4.5)
- Submission contact point (see 4.2)
- Overview or guide to the material in the submission
- Overall design rationale (if appropriate)
- Statement of proof of concept (see 4.6)
- Resolution of RFP mandatory and optional requirements

  Explain how your proposal satisfies the mandatory and (if applicable) optional requirements stated in Chapter 6. References to supporting material in Part II should be given.

  In addition, if your proposal does not satisfy any of the general requirements stated in Chapter 5, provide a detailed rationale.
- Responses to RFP issues to be discussed

  Discuss each of the "Issues To Be Discussed" identified in Chapter 6.

PART II

- Proposed specification

PART III

- Summary of optional versus mandatory interfaces

  Submissions must clearly distinguish interfaces that all implementations must support from those that may be optionally supported.
- Proposed compliance points

  Submissions should propose appropriate compliance points for implementations.
- Changes or extensions required to adopted OMG specifications

  Submissions must include a full specification of any changes or extensions required to existing OMG specifications. This should be in a form that enables "mechanical" section-by-section revision of the existing specification.
- Complete IDL definitions

  For reference purposes and to facilitate electronic usage, submissions should reproduce in one place a complete listing in compilable form of the IDL definitions proposed for standardization.

4.9 How to Submit

Submitters should send an electronic version of their submission to the *RFP Submissions Desk* (rfp@omg.org) at OMG by 5:00 PM U.S. Eastern Standard Time (22:00 UTC) on the day of the submission deadline. Acceptable formats are Postscript, ASCII, FrameMaker, Word, and WordPerfect. Submitters should make sure they receive electronic or voice confirmation of the successful receipt of their submission.

Submitters should also send, within three (3) working days after the submission deadline, a single hardcopy version of their submission to the attention of the “RFP Submissions Desk” at the main OMG address shown on the first page of this RFP.

In addition, submitters are responsible for making available 100 paper copies to attendees of the TF meeting immediately following a submission deadline. There are normally two such presentation meetings, one for the initial and one for the revised submissions.

5.0 General Requirements on Proposals

5.1 Mandatory Requirements

5.1.1 Proposals shall express interfaces in OMG IDL. Proposals should follow accepted OMG IDL and CORBA programming style. The correctness of the IDL shall be verified using at least one IDL compiler (and preferably more then one). In addition to IDL quoted in the text of the submission, all the IDL associated with the proposal shall be supplied to OMG in machine-readable form.

5.1.2 Proposals shall specify *operation behavior, sequencing*, and *side-effects* (if any).

5.1.3 Proposals shall be *precise* and *functionally complete*. There should be no implied or hidden interfaces, operations, or functions required to enable an implementation of the proposed specification.

5.1.4 Proposals shall clearly distinguish *mandatory* interfaces and other specification elements that all implementations must support from those that may be *optionally* supported.

5.1.5 Proposals shall *reuse* existing OMG specifications including CORBA, CORBAservices, and CORBAfacilities in preference to defining new interfaces to perform similar functions.

5.1.6 Proposals shall justify and fully specify any *changes or extensions* required to existing OMG specifications. This includes changes and extensions to CORBA inter-ORB protocols necessary to support interoperability. In general, OMG favors *upwards compatible* proposals that minimize changes and extensions to existing OMG specifications.

5.1.7 Proposals shall factor out functions that could be used in different contexts and specify their interfaces separately. Such *minimality* fosters reuse and avoids functional duplication.

5.1.8 Proposals shall use or depend on other interface specifications only where it is actually necessary. While re-use of existing interfaces to avoid duplication will be encouraged, proposals should avoid gratuitous use.

5.1.9 Proposals shall specify interfaces that are *compatible* and can be used with existing OMG specifications. Separate functions doing separate jobs should be capable of being used together where it makes sense for them to do so.

5.1.10 Proposals shall preserve maximum *implementation flexibility*. Implementation descriptions should not be included, however proposals may spec-

ify constraints on object behavior that implementations need to take into account over and above those defined by the interface semantics.

5.1.11 Proposals shall allow *independent implementations* that are *substitutable* and *interoperable*. An implementation should be replaceable by an alternative implementation without requiring changes to any client.

5.2 Evaluation criteria

Although the OMG adopts interface specifications, the technical viability of implementations will be taken into account during the evaluation process. The following criteria will be used:

5.2.1 Performance

Potential implementation trade-offs for performance will be considered.

5.2.2 Portability

The ease of implementation on a variety of ORB systems and software platforms will be considered.

5.2.3 Compliance: Inspectability and Testability

The adequacy of proposed specifications for the purposes of compliance inspection and testing will be considered. Specifications should provide sufficient constraints on interfaces and implementation characteristics to ensure that compliance can be unambiguously assessed through both manual inspection and automated testing.

6.0 Specific Requirements on Proposals

6.1 Problem Statement

There are many reasons to link health related data from multiple episodes of care. Perhaps the most crucial has to do with the quality of health care which often depends on the continuity of care and the timeliness of that information. Technical support for continous care provides techniques for linking data about the same person longitudinally across multiple computing environments.

Even with the enactment of legislation by various nations mandating the unique health care identifiers for person-identifiable health care information, distinct systems will continue to maintain independent internal identifiers associated with existing health care data. Even with a national unique health care identifier system a patient may not have their identifier with them at the time of needing health care. Many of the nations that have used unique healthcare identifiers have found that mistakes have been made in giving out the identifiers and patient identification systems help to discover these problems and prevent mistreatment.

While proprietary MPI systems currently offer solutions to many of these problems, there is no standard interface for client systems to access these patient identification services or for the MPI systems from multiple vendors to interoperate.

These patient identification systems typically use a collection of patient demographic data (e.g name, address, birth date, place of birth) and other identifying characteristics (e.g. social security number) in order to uniquely find the internal identifier for the person. The process of identifying a patient based on these criteria are constantly improving as increasingly sophisticated techniques are developed.

6.2 Scope of Proposals Sought

This RFP requests that responses address the following which are referred to as Patient IDentification Services (PIDS):

- The identification of a patient from a set of information about that patient.
- The interchange of patient identification information between two or more Patient Identification Service providers or domains.

6.3 Relationship to Existing OMG Specifications

CORBA Security Service - Even though this RFP does not ask for responses in an area that contains highly confidential data, there are serious concerns of patient confidentiality in the healthcare domain. It is expected that responses will use CORBA Security as the basis for providing confidentiality.

CORBA Naming Service - Since PIDS can be implemented at various levels of granularity (size of population covered by the PIDS) it is likely that they would be linked into a hierarchy via the CORBA Naming Service.

CORBA Query Service - This RFP has relationships to the services provided by the Query Service. It is anticipated that submissions will utilize it for querying when appropriate.

6.4 Related Documents and Standards

The following are OMG documents that contain related information to this RFP (http://www.omg.org/docs):

- corbamed/96-05-02 HealthMagic response to the CORBAmed RFI
- corbamed/96-05-05 RICHE response to the CORBAmed RFI
- corbamed/96-05-11 Health Data Sciences response to the CORBAmed RFI
- corbamed/95-05-13 NHS response to the CORBAmed RFI
- corbamed/96-08-04 Care Data Systems white paper on MPIs

The following document contains information related to this RFP but is not an OMG document:

- http://www.acl.lanl.gov/cpr (MPI Workshop)

The following standards have information related to the content of this RFP:

- HL7
- ASTM E31
- X12 Admit, Discharge, Transfer
- DICOM

6.5 Mandatory Requirements

The PIDS shall support storage and retrieval of patient identifying information.

Given patient identifying information the PIDS shall provide access to candidate matches.

The PIDS shall provide an indicator of accuracy of candidate matches.

The PIDS shall support the ability to merge and split patient identity records.

The PIDS shall support the ability to update patient identifying information.

The PIDS shall support the ability to perform matching of patient identifiers.

The PIDS shall support the ability to assign identifiers automatically.

The PIDS shall deal with the mapping of multiple identifiers for the same person.

The PIDS shall be flexible enough to work with an arbitrary number of explicit described patient identifying types and attributes.

6.6 Optional Requirements

While the satisfaction of the following optional requirements is desirable, proposals are not required to satisfy them.

The PIDS may support the interchange of patient identification information between two Patient ID Service providers or domains.

The PIDS may support federation of Patient ID Service providers or domains.

The proposals may support the ability to subscribe to notifications of updates to patient identity records.

The proposals may support the ability to use a standard set of identifying data for matching parameters (e.g. ASTM, CEN, HL7, DICOM).

The proposals may support the detection and reporting of suspected source identifier conflicts.

6.7 Issues to be discussed

The submission shall address how implementations would respect patient confidentiality and privacy including access control.

The submission shall discuss how the proposal deals with situations where multiple correct values can exist for a single parameter in patient identity information (e.g. multiple last names).

The submission shall address how their proposal addresses the administrative issues of a Patient Identification Service.

The submission shall explain how consistency of identifiers can be maintained accross multiple PIDS domains.

The submission shall discuss how the proposal deals with the ability to maintain an audit trail and the system data.

6.8 Evaluation Criteria

The proposals will be evaluated on their completeness and ability to address mandatory requirements. A submitter should give justification for any requirements not met or additional capabilities supplied by their submission.

The proposal should be scaleable so that it can be used for small department oriented systems as well as large multi-enterprise systems.

The solution should be implementable on a variety of systems and integrate with legacy systems.

Proposed specifications with simpler sets of interfaces are given higher priority in the evaluation.

The proposals should be flexible so that the PIDS could be used in various countries, states and enterprises that may have varying rules and would require different identifying information.

6.9 RFP Timetable

The timetable for this RFP is given below. Note that the TF may, in certain circumstances, extend deadlines while the RFP is running, or may elect to have more than one revised submission step. The latest timetable can always be found in the Member Services section of OMG's Web page (URL http://www.omg.org/)

Approx Day	**Event or *Activity***	**Actual Date**
	Preparation of RFP by TF	November 6, 1996
	Approval of RFP by Architecture Board *Review by TC ("Three week rule")*	November 7, 1996
0	TC votes to issue RFP	November 8, 1996
60	LOI to submit to RFP due	February 14, 1997
120	Initial submissions due	April 14, 1997
134	Voter registration closes	April 14, 1997
141	Initial submission presentations	May, 1997
	Preliminary evaluation by TF	
240	Revised submissions due	August 14, 1997
261	Revised submission presentations	September, 1997
	Final evaluation and selection by TF *Recommendation to AB and TC*	
	Approval by Architecture Board *Review by TC ("Three week rule")*	
330	DTC votes to recommend specifications	November 1997
360	BOD votes to adopt specifications	December 1997